

002090

JPRS-TAC-85-048

8 November 1985

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED

1 9 9 9 0 4 1 4 0 9 0

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

9
75
A04

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

8 November 1985

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

Italy's AVANTI! Views CPSU Letter on Disarmament (Rome AVANTI!, 5 Oct 85).....	1
Seminar, Report to Government Weigh Joining SDI Project (Olav Trygge Storvik; Oslo AFTENPOSTEN, 10 Oct 85).....	2

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR's Burlatskiy on Reagan's Negotiating Strategy (Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 16 Oct 85).....	5
USSR: Special NATO Meeting Discusses Gorbachev Proposals (Various sources, 15-17 Oct 85).....	7
'Lively Debate'.....	7
'Alarm' at U.S. Statements, by Sergey Alekseyev.....	8
Impact on World Public.....	9
Allies Urge Positive Response.....	10
USSR's Bogdanov Gloomy on Progress of Talks, Blames U.S. (Moscow MOSCOW NEWS, No 39, 29 Sep 85).....	11

SALT/START ISSUES

Briefs	
USSR Rejects Weinberger Charges.....	16
Standing Consultative Commission Meets.....	16

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

UK Presented 'Formal' Proposal for N-Arms Talks (Tom McMullan; London PRESS ASSOCIATION, 17 Oct 85).....	17
Moscow Broadcasts Urge Arms Talks With France, UK (Moscow Television Service, 10 Oct 85; Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland, 10 Oct 85).....	18
Gorbachev in Paris, by Boris Kalyagin.....	18
Broadcast to Britain.....	19

USSR: New French Missile Has Neutron Warhead Potential (Moscow IZVESTIYA, 14 Oct 85).....	21
USSR: October Comments on Dutch Opposition to Deployment (Various sources, various dates).....	22
Protests Intensify	22
NATO Worried	23
Christian Democrats Opposed, by Boris Kalyagin	24
Against Netherlands Interests	25
'Tension Rising', by Eduard Kovalev	26
'Period of Hope, Alarm'	27
Soviet Gen Lebedev Discusses SS-20's in Dutch Newspaper (Raymond van den Boogaard; Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD, 18 Oct 85).....	30
Briefs	
TASS Reports Chinese Launch	32
CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE	
Comments by Soviet Envoy Grinevskiy at CDE Session (Moscow PRAVDA, 12 Oct 85; Moscow TASS, 18 Oct 85).....	33
Military Notification, NATO Maneuvers	33
Sees Results as 'Positive'	33
USSR: Article Criticizes West's CDE Proposals (V. Shatrov; Moscow MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN, No 10, Oct 85)...	35
NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS	
TASS: Greece Initiates Removal of U.S. Nuclear Stockpiles (Moscow TASS, 22 Oct 85).....	41
Briefs	
Danish CP Urges Nordic NFZ	42
GENERAL	
TASS on Weinberger 16 October News Conference: New Zealand, SDI (Moscow TASS International Service, 16 Oct 85).....	43
PRAVDA Urges Favorable U.S. Response to Soviet Initiatives (S. Menshikov; Moscow PRAVDA, 10 Oct 85).....	44
Moscow Talk Show on Prospects for Reagan-Gorbachev Meeting (Moscow Domestic Service, 18 Oct 85).....	48

USSR's Zagladin Interviewed in Austrian Newspaper (Vadim Zagladin Interview; Vienna VOLKSSTIMME, 24 Oct 85)...	51
USSR's Ponomarev Addresses Socialist International on Arms Race (Moscow PRAVDA, 18 Oct 85).....	53
TASS Reports UN Speeches on Arms Issues (Moscow TASS, 22 Oct 85).....	59
TASS: USSR UN Delegation Suggests Non-Use of Force Declaration (Moscow TASS, 7 Oct 85).....	61
Soviet Journal on Arms Issues, European Cooperation (Moscow MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN, No 10, Oct 85).....	62
CHINA DAILY Commentator on Peace, Disarmament (Beijing CHINA DAILY, 18 Oct 85).....	69
Briefs	
TASS on UN Radiation Report	70

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

ITALY'S AVANTI! VIEWS CPSU LETTER ON DISARMAMENT

PM151319 Rome AVANTI! in Italian 5 Oct 85 pp 1, 13

[Unattributed report: "CPSU Letter to PSI on Gorbachev's Proposals"]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee sent the PSI Directorate a lengthy letter yesterday outlining the new Soviet disarmament proposals. PSI Foreign Affairs Department Chief Valdo Spini announced that "the PSI welcomes the letter from the CPSU Central Committee, which it considers a sign of esteem toward the PSI and the role that it can perform on the international level.

"Gorbachev's proposals, publicly announced in France, would in any case have been examined by the PSI--a party which actively participates in an action of mutual understanding that can lead to the success of the East-West negotiations. The action carried out in this direction by Prime Minister Craxi has elicited broad international response and recognition. PSI bodies," Spini concluded, "will examine the letter in depth and draw up a reply."

Here are the main points of the letter:

1. The Soviet Union has approached the United States with the proposal of coming to an agreement on the total banning by both sides of offensive space weapons and on a truly radical reduction--by 50 percent--of their nuclear weapons capable of reaching each other's territories.

2. The USSR also considers it possible to reach a separate agreement on medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe, not linking this directly with the issue of space and strategic weapons.

At the same time, bearing in mind the position occupied by the French and British nuclear strength within the European balance of forces, we are willing to initiate direct negotiations on this issue with France and Britain.

3. As a unilateral measure, the USSR has rendered nonoperational the SS-20 missiles in the European zone additionally deployed starting in June 1984, that is, since the start of our implementation of countermeasures in response to the deployment of U.S. Euromissiles.

At the same time, the permanent launch installations in which these missiles have been placed will be dismantled within 2 months. This means that, together with the current dismantling of SS-4 missiles, the overall number of Soviet medium-range missiles in the European zone is now much smaller than 10 or even 15 years ago.

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SEMINAR, REPORT TO GOVERNMENT WEIGH JOINING SDI PROJECT

Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 10 Oct 85 p 5

[Article by Olav Trygge Storvik]

[Text] On Wednesday, experts issued a serious warning that Norway and other European countries should not refuse to participate in the American SDI research program. The warnings came during a day-long seminar arranged for specially invited guests by the Study Committee of the Defense Institute Association. At the same time, they called for greater realism and sobriety in the Norwegian debate on SDI--a debate that, so far, has been based on ignorance.

It was precisely this lack of knowledge concerning what SDI, the American dream of a comprehensive strategic defense without nuclear weapons, is actually all about that led the Study Committee of the Defense Institute to initiate a realistic debate. The experts who presented papers included Erik Klippenberg, director of the Defense Research Institute (FFI), and Lt Gen Tonne Huitfeldt. Together with two other researchers, Klippenberg recently completed a report to the government on the extent, content, and direction of the American SDI research. The group visited the United States and talked with administration representatives at all levels. They also visited research laboratories.

Until recently, Huitfeldt was director of the international military staff at NATO headquarters in Brussels. He has followed the progress of SDI within the alliance from an extremely close vantage point. Political representatives at the meeting included undersecretary Oddmund Hammerstad and member of parliament Knut Frydenlund.

In his speech, Klippenberg strongly stressed the enormous technological problems involved in an extensive strategic defense system deployed on platforms in space. Although there are no fundamental scientific obstacles to such a system, its completion lies in the distant future and it is doubtful that anyone alive today will see it. The development of supercomputers and programs to guide the system remains far in the future and there are also other enormous demands on the system. One problem, for example, is to discover and recognize far-off targets. According to Klippenberg, the precision demands may be compared to distinguishing between two points that are 2 mm apart at a distance of 2 km. In addition, he estimates that it would take 100 years

to transport the necessary equipment into space with the present transport system of space shuttles.

It is impossible to distinguish between civil and military research in SDI, according to Klippenberg. He warned against refusing to participate in this research. If we do not participate in the American research program, we will have no insight into the problems that are involved when political decisions must be made sometime in the future. This would mean we would have no influence on these decisions.

The United States is now investing 200 billion kroner over a 5-year period. The SDI program will be the most important development in new technology during the next 10 years. The old industries in Europe are dying out, he said, and SDI will lay much of the groundwork for new industries. Europe is already spending more to import information technology than to import oil and this trend will continue.

Reactions

Lt Gen Tonne Huitfeldt discussed the strategic and security aspects of the SDI plans. He described developments in this field on the Soviet side and demonstrated that the Soviet Union, by linking warning and monitoring systems with defense systems, would soon have a strategic defense system that would protect all of its territory against ballistic missiles. The Soviet Union is probably the leader in various fields, such as particle and laser weapons. The Soviet research effort is hardly less intense than that of the United States, but the Soviet Union has not given this research a collective term, as the Americans have. He also reviewed developments in strategic thinking with regard to offensive and defensive weapons and discussed European reactions to the American SDI plans. He pointed out that the Soviets had admitted that it was the SDI program that had brought them back to the negotiating table in Geneva, but that the United States could hardly agree to cut back its research in this field.

Topic For Talks

"Washington probably has not yet decided whether or not SDI will be discussed in the negotiations with the Soviet Union in Geneva," member of parliament Knut Frydenlund said. Frydenlund is a former chairman of the Defense Committee, but he is now the primary spokesman of the Labor Party on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Frydenlund wants the European, and especially the Norwegian, governments to advise the United States to include SDI in the negotiations. In this connection, he points to the letter the government sent to the Foreign Affairs Committee on SDI last spring.

Much could be gained if Reagan, during his summit meeting with Gorbachev, declares himself willing to negotiate over SDI. That could serve to convince the Soviet Union to make important concessions. If the Americans are unwilling

to discuss SDI in the negotiations, then Europe could find itself in a serious situation that the Russians would know how the use, he said. He pointed out that Germany, especially, would find itself in a dilemma.

In the speech presented by undersecretary Oddmund Hammerstad, he stated that the most realistic possibility was that in the short term, i.e. during the next 10 to 20 years, the United States would tone down its program for developing SDI to make it a limited defense system. He said that the research was fully permissible in the framework of the ABM treaty. He also pointed out that no change in NATO's strategy would be called for in the near future as a result of SDI.

9336

CSO: 3639/18

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR'S BURLATSKIY ON REAGAN'S NEGOTIATING STRATEGY

PM161030 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 16 Oct 85 p 9

[Fedor Burlatskiy "Political Observer's Notes": "Is It Not Time To Adopt a Constructive Tone?"]

[Text] The closer the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva gets, the faster the wheels of the White House political and propaganda machine turn. One speech after another is made by the U.S. President, the secretary of state, the secretary of defense, the assistant for national security affairs, the press secretary, and many other U.S. Administration spokesmen. As for articles in the mass media in this connection, they are countless.

A WASHINGTON POST article entitled "What Is Behind the Tough Line" drew my attention in the whole discordant chorus of contradictory forecasts and recommendations.

"At first glance," the newspaper writes, "President Reagan has taken a tough stance that is seemingly not subject to review on SDI, on which he is pinning hopes of discovering an effective space shield against Soviet nuclear missiles.

In his speeches and at press conferences Reagan solemnly vows his unwavering resolve so to give way on the "star wars" issue when he meets with Soviet leader M.S. Gorbachev in Geneva 19-20 November. But presidential assistants and advisers involved in preparations for the summit meeting suggest that Reagan is more flexible than he seems on "star wars," and he is more interested in reaching agreement with the Russians than his statements might indicate."

The newspaper goes on to describe citing high-ranking staffers in the White House apparatus, the President's typical negotiating style: Apparently, he first adopts a firm initial position, refuses to make "anticipatory concessions," keeps his cards close to his chest, and concludes a deal only when the danger of collapse hangs over the talks.

"Ronald Reagan does not display arrogance particularly often, but he is proud of himself in this respect," Michael Deaver, his friend and former White House chief of staff, said. "He is convinced that he knows how to negotiate and knows exactly when to compromise."

What may the compromise be, according to the newspaper? The compromise could consist of certain concessions on the question of the "star wars" program provided that the Soviet Union substantially reduces its heavy ground-based ICBM's. The newspaper is not specific on the question of the nature of the concessions regarding SDI or the question of reciprocal and equal arms reductions by both sides -- the Soviet Union and the United States.

Two questions arise in this connection. The first and main one concerns the nature of a possible agreement. The Soviet Union has submitted its proposal and has thus defined its understanding of the compromise formula. This is the proposal for a total ban on space strike weapons for both sides and a 50 percent reduction in nuclear weapons capable of reaching one another's territory. The Soviet Union has still not received an official reply to this proposal. So that the U.S. compromise formula -- if it exists -- remains unknown. It would be unreasonable to delay until the last moment, since the sides' positions need to be agreed in advance if the summit meeting is to be as productive as possible.

The second question concerns the style of the talks. According to one of Reagan's aides, the President will prove in Geneva that "he knows how to bargain" and "Reagan wants to negotiate effectively with M.S. Gorbachev, and this means that you must not show your hand prematurely."

It is difficult for us to judge the extent to which the newspaper has captured the specific features of the President's political style. But if this really is his style, then it is totally unsuited to such a major event as the Geneva summit meeting, from which the whole world expects positive results. What is needed and is appropriate here is a completely different style; an honest, frank, and unambiguous presentation of positions as the only condition for reaching accord. So, surely it is time to abandon the constant demonstrations of a "tough line," "inflexibility," and "ability to bargain," and to adopt a constructive tone, if, of course, the President is truly prepared for agreements?

CSO: 5200/1069

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR: SPECIAL NATO MEETING DISCUSSES GORBACHEV PROPOSALS

'Lively Debate'

LD151127 Moscow TASS in English 1102 GMT 15 Oct 85

[Text] Brussels, October 15 TASS -- TASS correspondent Albert Balebanov reports:

A special session of the NATO council of foreign ministers [words indistinct] the headquarters of the Atlantic bloc today.

It has been officially announced here that the session is connected with the USA's preparation for the forthcoming summit meeting in Geneva between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and President Ronald Reagan of the United States. As has been stated by official spokesmen of NATO, U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz will hold consultations with its NATO allies on the new Soviet proposals which were formulated by Mikhail Gorbachev during his recent visit to France.

The very fact of the holding of the session is indicative of the lively interest which has been aroused in Western Europe by the new Soviet initiative in the field of disarmament. The session has been called on the joint initiative of Belgium and Holland which protested at Washington's intention to ignore the stand of its allies for the military-political grouping, limiting itself to an exchange of views with the leaders of its six major trading partners -- Japan, Canada, the FRG, Britain, Italy, and France. Other West European countries have told the Reagan administration that they are also interested in disarmament matters. The White House reluctantly had to agree to the convocation of a special session of the NATO council only after France declined to participate in the separate meeting of the "Big Seven".

Washington is obviously worried by the enthusiasm with which NATO countries regard the Soviet proposals. Unlike the White House, the government of many West European countries have approached positively Moscow's initiative, declaring for the need for a constructive reply to the Soviet gesture of good will.

Judging by statements which were made in recent days by spokesmen of the Washington administration, detected in the U.S. approach to a special session of the NATO council can be an obvious endeavour to belittle the importance of the Soviet proposals on disarmament, to distort their essence, to question them and thereby to try to discredit them. This is why, maybe, France and Canada decided against sending their foreign ministers to Brussels and resolved to limit themselves to the level of their ambassador to NATO. The [name indistinct] news agency points out that problems regarding the attitude to the Soviet proposals have obviously arisen between Washington, on the one hand and Paris and Ottawa, on the other.

8 November 1985

'Alarm' at U.S. Statements

OW170458 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 16 Oct 85

[From the "Novosti" newscast; commentary by Sergey Alekseyev]

[Text] An extraordinary session of the NATO Council at the Foreign Ministers level has been held in Brussels.

[Alekseyev] Hello comrades. The formal reason for this previously unplanned session of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries can be given as the demands of Belgium and the Netherlands. Their governments, like the governments of other minor countries in NATO, were ignored by Reagan, who at the end of this month is gathering this allies for consultations prior to the USSR-U.S. summit in Geneva.

But the matter does not simply lie in the hurt feelings or stung pride of U.S. allies, who did not receive an invitation from Reagan. In actual fact both major and minor NATO countries were drawn to the session, primarily because of the serious alarm in many of them evoked by official Washington reaction to the latest Soviet peace initiatives, and by the political baggage with which the U.S. President is being equipped -- even before the advice of allies has been heard -- by member of his administration for the talks with the Soviet Union.

This alarm was clearly seen in Brussels, where the West European partners of the United States insistently urged it not to reject the new Soviet disarmament proposals, but to use them as a basis for the coming talks in Geneva. They appealed for adherence to previously concluded USSR-U.S. agreements on arms limitation, particularly the ABM Treaty.

Take U.S. Secretary of State Shultz. In his speech at the Brussels session and at the press conference on its results, he created the impression that official Washington does not seem to heed the appeals of its NATO partners. He failed to give any guarantees that the U.S. Administration would renounce its desire for military superiority, and attempt to achieve fair and equal agreements with the Soviet Union.

Nevertheless, the results of the Brussels session and the serious interest and close attention displayed by the NATO countries to the constructive Soviet initiatives, obviously bothers the U.S. Administration now, and will force it to have second thoughts.

Impact on World Public

LD170921 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 16 Oct 85

[Text] According to an AFP report from Brussels, at the special NATO Council session, West European bloc allies have persistently recommended the United States not reject the new Soviet disarmament proposals, but rather take them as a basis for the forthcoming Geneva talks. Here is a commentary on the latest news bulletin. At the microphone is Boris Andrianov:

Many foreign observers note that the convocation of the NATO Council special session is, in itself, extraordinary. That is because it is being held at the request of Belgium and the Netherlands, who offered to discuss, within the framework of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the joint reaction of the West to the new Soviet proposals formulated by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, during his official visit to France.

These foreign policy initiatives have caused an enormous impact on the widest possible circles of the world public. They have seen in the Soviet Union's peaceful proposals an answer to today's main question: Shall humanity live in peace, or shall it perish in the conflagration of a thermonuclear catastrophe? International development has now approached a dangerous junction, and the situation cannot be overcome unless the most responsible decisions are made which would aim at limiting the arms race and stopping the downward trend to war. These decisions cannot be put off; if they are put off, dangerous processes threatening the mere existence of mankind could go out of control.

For its part the Soviet Union is seriously prepared to change the situation in the world. The large-scale complex of realistic and constructive measures suggested with the aim of averting militarization of space, curbing the nuclear and other arms race and ensuring development of the fruitful international cooperation in Europe and the world as a whole serves as a proof of that. Realization of these measures would lead to a true reverse in the development of international relations. Such a shift is in the interests of all peoples. The whole world has seen that the Soviet Union not only calls for peace, but also does everything in its power in order to ensure a peaceful future for the entire planet.

Speaking yesterday at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev noted that we talk about the aims of our international policy and the means to carry it openly. In this sense our policy is quite predictable; it lacks riddles or uncertainties. This is a policy based on the Leninist idea of the peaceful coexistence of the two opposite systems. We proceed from the fact. CPSU Central Committee the general secretary pointed out, that only a stable and reliable policy is worthy of states and parties which realize their responsibility for the world's destiny in our century, one which is overflowing with controversies.

The Soviet proposals, directed at normalization of the political climate, have become the center of discussions on various levels in the Western countries. Pronouncements aimed at the NATO Council special session in Brussels prove this as well. They confirm in a graphic way that those Western political figures who assess the situation in a sensible way cannot fail to see that the Soviet proposals are opening wide opportunities for a concrete dialogue at the forthcoming Geneva summit.

Allies Urge Positive Reponse

PM171405 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 17 Oct 85 p 3

[TASS report: "At the NATO Council Session"]

[Text] Brussels, 16 Oct -- The West European allies in the NATO bloc insistently advised the United States not to reject the new Soviet proposals on disarmament, but to take them as the basis of the forthcoming talks in Geneva. That is one of the main results of the extraordinary NATO council session at foreign ministerial level which was held here.

As L. Tindemans, Belgian minister of external affairs, stressed in his speech at the session, the Soviet proposals "could form the basis for talks." In his words, "the Soviet initiative on disarmament is a new opportunity for dialogue and progress in future." FRG Foreign Minister H.D. Genscher noted in his speech that the West must "give a constructive response to M.S. Gorbachev's initiative on disarmament questions," which he put forward during his visit to France.

The allies called on the United States to adhere to agreements concluded earlier between the USSR and the United States on arms limitation, in particular the Treaty on the Limitation of Antiballistic Missile (ABM) Systems. It is reported in circles close to the delegations which took part in the session that this appeal was contained, in particular, in the speeches of the representatives from Denmark, France, Greece, and other countries.

The United States' European partners in the alliance also came out unambiguously in favor of establishing constructive bilateral Soviet-American relations. In the words of the Belgian minister of external affairs, the forthcoming Soviet-American summit meeting "could be the start of a new era of dialogue." But U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz, through his speeches at the session and at the press conference on its results, gave the impression that official Washington does not particularly intend to heed the appeals of its NATO partners. The head of the U.S. foreign policy department gave the allies no guarantees that the U.S. Administration would renounce the desire for military superiority or seek to achieve equal, honest accords with the USSR.

The very fact of the holding of the NATO council session is evidence of the great interest aroused, especially in Western Europe, by the new, constructive Soviet initiatives in the disarmament sphere. It was convened on the joint initiative of Belgium and the Netherlands, which protested Washington's intention of ignoring the position of its NATO allies and confining itself only to an exchange of opinions with the leaders of its six biggest trading partners -- Japan, Canada, the FRG, Britain, Italy, and France. "We also have a vital interest in disarmament questions," the U.S. Administration was told in Western Europe.

CSO: 5200/1064

USSR'S BOGDANOV GLOOMY ON PROGRESS OF TALKS, BLAMES U.S.

PM041403 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 39, 29 Sep 85 p 5

[Institute of U.S. and Canadian Studies Deputy Director Radomir Bogdanov article:
"A Simple Formula for Security in a Complex Time"]

[Text] The announcement of the forthcoming meetings to be held by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Francois Mitterrand, president of France, and then with Ronald Reagan, the U.S. President, has generated hopes for the normalization of relations in Europe and in the world. A real feeling of optimism has appeared.

It is quite clear why all this is happening. International tensions which are pushing the world towards the danger point have been steadily growing in the last five-six years.

Beginning with the A-bombing of Hiroshima, the USA has produced 60,000 nuclear warheads for 71 different types of weapons used within 166 combat systems. The cost of all that weaponry has run into 750 billion dollars.

The goal of this arms race is an open secret. The arms race is being conducted against the USSR -- to achieve supremacy over it.

Therein lies the source of both Soviet-US and international tensions.

We should note, in the context, one feature of our time. Whereas in the past, bad political relations bred the arms race, today there is the opposite happening. The arms race is now the cause for the increased worsening of the international situation with all the resulting dangerous consequences. As a result, granted the entire complexity of many problems in East-West relations in our nuclear-space age, they all boil down to one main problem -- that of survival, of preserving life and civilization of earth.

Grave events, exacerbating East-West relations, have recently taken place. They include, above all, the deployment of new US medium-range missiles in Western Europe. We regard this US and NATO actions as the implementation of the "decapitalization" of the USSR doctrine which was elaborated in the USA a long time ago. Thus, theory got material support in the guise of first-strike weapons, such as Pershing-2 and cruise missiles which are intended to smash, in a few minutes, the command and administration centres in the USSR.

The second circumstance which has strongly aggravated the political atmosphere is the elaboration of plans for waging "star wars", now being implemented by Washington. In spite of the fact that this measure has been called the Strategic Defense Initiative, it is essentially, just one more attempt to obtain military superiority over the USSR by putting on a high-tech spurt.

It is hard to assess the elaboration of the "star wars" plans, which the US is attempting to do, in any other way but as a desire to perform a disarming first strike with impunity, against the USSR, protecting the USA with an anti-missile shield against a retaliatory strike from the USSR. Judge for yourself. At first Washington deploys its new offensive nuclear weapons in Western Europe, and then starts to elaborate plans for the building of an ABM shield.

I would like also to draw attention to the fact that the present US Administration has been nurturing a hate campaign against the USSR for the past five years. The sophisticated slanderous propaganda has gone so far in describing our country as a disciple of hell, that even nuclear weapons become acceptable when placed against this background. Any means may be used against the "empire of evil".

We are also very much troubled by the militarization of politicians' thinking, which has been going on for the last few years in the USA, in parallel with the arms race, which is going on at an ever greater rate. This is especially clear from the annual reports made by Caspar Weinberger, US secretary of defense, to US Congress.

The reports, essentially, show that the USA intends to guarantee only its own security. And Washington regards everything else existing in the world as non-essential.

I would like to say in this context that socialism has established itself firmly in the world. So, the West, the USA included, has no other way out but to coexist peacefully with us.

In our opinion security today can be only general, or, in other words, only collective security. As Mikhail Gorbachev said unequivocally in his interview to the TIME magazine, either we perish together or we survive together. As I see it, this is a very simple and understandable formula for security in our age. At present there is no Soviet security without US security, no Soviet security without European security, as there is no US or European security without USSR security.

It is quite a significant fact that Mikhail Gorbachev will make his first visit to France. This testimony of the major significance ascribed by the USSR to its good relations with Western Europe, its nearest neighbour. This is also a step towards developing the traditional ties of friendship that bind the USSR and France. It also proves that in the opinion of the USSR, France can play a constructive role in improving East-West relations.

The USSR is deeply convinced that today the system of international relations is in need of a serious restructuring along the lines of, above all, peaceful coexistence and collective security. It has to be said that this need is penetrating more and more also the minds of European leaders.

Europe was a battlefield for many years. World War II, in which 61 countries took part, was the cruelest and bloodiest of all wars. Fifty-four million people died in its six years. The main bulk of casualties was in Europe. Therefore, it is only natural that the memories about the victims and destruction, which, I'd say, are entered in the

Europeans' genetic code, make the questions of war and peace more sensitive for us than for the people living on the other continents. European countries are located too near each other. They are not divided by oceans.

And it is precisely in Europe that the military groups of the two blocs -- NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization -- are confronting each other after the war. It is precisely in Europe that the biggest number of troops, most of the tanks, artillery pieces, combat aircraft, etc., are deployed. And the most frightening element is that Europe has been turned into a giant depot for tactical and operational-tactical nuclear weapons.

It is perfectly clear that it is impossible to start a war, using nuclear weapons, in Europe where distances do not exceed hundreds or a thousand kilometres. It would be tantamount to suicide. It should be added to this that so-called conventional arms are so colossal in their capacity and scope, that it is apparently already as deadly to wage a conventional war as a nuclear war.

Therefore, the reorientation of the politicians' way of thinking, from military categories -- from the hopes pinned on solving problems by military force to peaceful way of thinking and a search for the possibility of securing a durable peace in Europe -- has become a dire necessity.

This road imparts great hopes. We have already picked up some definite experience of travelling along this road. The decade of detente was quite fruitful for both East and West, showing that we can live in peace, and develop mutually beneficial cooperation. I regard a return to this state in our relations granted the presence of political goodwill of the interested sides as quite realistic.

It must be said that the USSR has exerted tremendous consistent efforts so as not to lose the heritage of the detente decade and, if possible, to enrich it.

It was extremely hard to do. An administration emerged in January 1981 in Washington which could only think in categories of power confrontation. It has based its policy, and this is no exaggeration, on two ideas fixes. One was the slightly modified old idea of "rolling back" the USSR, and the new idea of bringing pressure to bear on the USSR in such a way that it would change its internal system.

The USSR proceeded, in such conditions, along two roads to preserve the detente heritage. On the one hand, steps were taken so that the USA would not be able to upset the military equilibrium. On the other hand, the USSR put forward peace initiatives striving to prevent US relations and of the international relations as a whole from sliding towards a military catastrophe.

We insisted that the entire system of talks on arms control, aimed at disarmament, go on functioning. We are not responsible that a whole range of talks were stopped. They were blocked by the US side. The USSR was forced to stop only one negotiation -- on medium-range nuclear weapons, because the USA and NATO had upset the military balance in the European theatre. So these talks lost all sense in such conditions.

New Soviet-US talks on an entire package of questions, pertaining to nuclear and space weapons, started this March in Geneva.

The news emanating from Washington and the US Administration's practical deeds show that the decision to militarize space has already been taken in the USA. However, we are not losing hope that common sense will prevail and that, in the long run, an accord, satisfactory to both sides, will be reached. But a situation is taking shape now where it is impossible -- without precise knowledge as to what decision the US Administration will finally take on deployment of weapons in space -- to speak about making progress in dramatically reducing strategic nuclear arms and solving the problem of medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe. All these issues are interconnected.

Why are we so alarmed in connection with the possibility of the USA militarizing outer space? One reason has already been mentioned. The implementation of the SDI must, as its authors think, make it possible for the USA to deliver the first nuclear strike with impunity.

The militarization of space will also lead to a new round in the arms race which will be distinguished by an absolutely new qualitative level.

The Geneva talks on nuclear and space weapons are now in the focus of all the problems of Soviet-US relations. Unfortunately, the first two rounds have ended unfruitfully. We realize only too well why this is happening.

The USA is not as yet prepared to discuss the issue of the non-militarization of space. It continues to insist that the so-called research programme is its right. But the entire matter lies in the fact that this programme provides not only for theoretical research. It is aimed at totally real things. In line with practical orders from Pentagon, prototypes will be manufactured of various types of weapons to be used against targets on earth from space, and these prototypes will be tested. So, what kind of a research programme is this?

Our country regards the complete elimination of nuclear weapons as its ideal. Their gradual reductions would lead to this. We reject the weird logics according to which nuclear weapons can be liquidated only through the development of even more sophisticated types of these arms, including space weapons. Rejection of the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative would pave the way to the most dramatic reductions of offensive nuclear-weapons. This is, of course, of paramount importance for strengthening security.

The USSR recently made a very important step directed at guaranteeing universal security. The decision was taken, on August 6, the day of the 40th anniversary of the nuclear bombing of Hiroshima, to stop all the nuclear tests in the USSR until January 1, 1986. This was not an easy step for the USSR to make as the USSR had to interrupt a series of nuclear weapon tests.

As we know, a feature of these weapons is that they must be periodically tested and checked. When a country suspends tests, then essentially it deprives itself of the confidence that its nuclear weapons are operational in the event of hostilities. And if nuclear tests are suspended for a long time, then the weapons become unreliable and practically turn into a toothless devil, who can bite no longer. Therefore the moratorium is of colossal practical significance. We appealed to the USA to emulate our example and declared that if they did so, the moratorium would become of unlimited duration.

And the matter is not only that we have stopped a series of nuclear tests. According to published data, the USA has performed 756 such tests since 1945 and the USSR -- 200 less. Therefore, the refusal of the USA to emulate our example, its demonstrative announcement on the holding of a new nuclear test, and, of course, its decision on testing anti-satellite weapons, does not testify at all to the good intentions of the USA on the threshold of the forthcoming summit in Geneva.

The restructuring of the system of international relations on the basis of universal security is the affair of not only the great powers. This concerns all states, large and small. We have never just looked at the world only through the prism of the Soviet-U.S. relations. Even their complete normalization is far from sufficient to solve all the complex international problems. However, the lack of normal Soviet-U.S. relations makes the task of improving the international situation much more difficult to perform. And this is precisely what determines the importance which we continue to ascribe to the question of normalizing relations with the USA.

I would like to remind the reader at this point of the remark made by Harold Nicolson, a well-known British diplomat, who wrote in one of his works, that a country, engaged in talks, must win over the confidence of the other side if it wishes to reach any agreement. I think this comment is still pertinent today.

One gets the impression that the current U.S. Administration, which consented to the Geneva meeting under pressure brought to bear by public opinion within its own country, by Congress and by its own allies, is coming to this meeting with a somewhat distorted idea as to what it should and should not be working for in Geneva.

First of all, this administration is trying to create the impression that its own pressure brought to bear on the USSR has had a favourable effect -- power pressuring. Washington declares that the arms race, launched by the USA, has scared Moscow so much that it has been forced to agree to the meeting. Therefore, let's go on with the arms race and then we'll be able to get even more concessions from the USSR. This logic is totally fallacious.

The answer to this very dangerous approach to the Geneva meeting was formulated in Mikhail Gorbachev's reply to the TIME magazine. The meeting can be a success only on the basis of complete equality, equality of the sides and realization of the fact that we have not lost a war to the USA, signing no capitulation, and that we owe the USA nothing, as indeed the USA owes us nothing. This is a genuine foundation for constructive talks.

If a relevant atmosphere, which is very important, can be created before the talks start, then we can expect the meeting to live up to the hopes of the people both of Europe and the USA. In any event, the USSR is prepared to hold the most serious talks in Geneva.

CSO: 5200/1069

SALT/START ISSUES

BRIEFS

USSR REJECTS WEINBERGER CHARGES--A Soviet representative has described inventions made by the American Defense Secretary, Weinberger, as an attempt to undermine the chances of success at the forthcoming Soviet-American summit. The head of the Foreign Ministry's Press Department, Vladimir Lomeyko, addressed journalists in Sofia. He refuted Weinberger's allegations that the Soviet Union had been deploying new intercontinental missiles, thereby violating the SALT II treaty. The Soviet Union has been fully honoring this treaty and has not been deploying new missiles in its violation, Lomeyko emphasized. [Text] [Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 23 Oct 85]

STANDING CONSULTATIVE COMMISSION MEETS--Geneva, October 9 TASS--A scheduled session of the Soviet-American Permanent Consultative Commission has opened here today. The commission was set up to contribute to the implementation of the aims and provisions of the treaty on the limitation of anti-ballistic missile defence systems and the U.S.-Soviet interim agreement on certain measures with respect to the limitation of strategic offensive arms, which were concluded on May 26, 1972, and the agreement on measures to lessen the danger of outbreak of nuclear war, which was concluded between the two countries on September 30, 1971. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1710 GMT 9 Oct 85]

CSO: 5200/1062

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

UK PRESENTED 'FORMAL' PROPOSAL FOR N-ARMS TALKS

LD171140 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1051 GMT 17 Oct 85

[By Tom McMullan, PA Diplomatic correspondent]

[Text] Britain has now received a formal proposal from the Soviet Union for direct talks on nuclear weapons. Downing Street aides confirmed today that a letter from Soviet leader Mr Mikhail Gorbachev had been delivered to the prime minister.

Officials declined to go into details of the proposal other than to say that it was along the lines of Gorbachev's speech in Paris two weeks ago, when he said the Soviets would like direct talks with Britain and France on their nuclear weapons. President Mitterrand has already turned down the suggestion.

At the time the Soviet Embassy in London delivered an extract from the speech to the Foreign Office but made clear that this did not amount to a formal proposal. Whitehall officials said today that the latest message which was handed over by an official of the Soviet Embassy to Mr Derek Thomas, political director at the Foreign Office amounted to a formal proposal.

Mrs Thatcher is unlikely to reply until she returns to London at the end of next week following her meeting in New York with President Reagan and other major leaders.

CSO: 5200/1071

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

MOSCOW BROADCASTS URGE ARMS TALKS WITH FRANCE, UK

Gorbachev in Paris

LD111358 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 10 Oct 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video talk by political observer Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] Hello, comrades. The Soviet Union and France were in at the origins of European detente. They have now been destined to give fresh impetus to this policy. This is one of the most important outcomes of the visit of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to Paris. The term detente itself was once again to be heard in the course of the talks, confirming, as it were, the need for the speediest possible return to the tried and vindicated course. The leaders of the Soviet Union and France were able to rise above existing differences, analyze the processes taking place in the world, and exchange views on what the contribution of both countries could be to improving the international situation and on how to put an end to the armaments race.

Great attention was paid to the problem of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe. For the purpose of facilitating an agreement on their speediest mutual reduction the Soviet Union proposed that an appropriate agreement be concluded separately and without being directly linked with the problem of space and strategic armaments.

We explained the essence of our standpoint on such a question as the position of the nuclear potential of France and Britain in the European balance of forces. We consider that this subject is becoming more and more pressing in character. It is for this reason that the Soviet Union proposed that direct talk on this be commenced with France and Britain, in order to find a mutually acceptable solution by joint efforts.

It needs to be made clear once again that we are talking not about reducing French or British nuclear forces but of balancing them with the Soviet nuclear potential in Europe. The United States has always attempted to leave the nuclear forces of France and Britain out of the context of talks on mutual limitation of nuclear armaments, but meanwhile Britain possesses 64 sea-based ballistic missiles which carry 192 nuclear warheads. Till recently France had 18 land-based ballistic missiles and 80 sea-based ones. However, a new French atomic submarine, "L'Inflexible," recently went into service. According

to the Paris LE MONDE it has the same destructive power as France's entire nuclear forces that existed till now. So the nuclear potential of Britain and France is rapidly increasing, and we are no longer able to turn a blind eye to this. Till now the positions of Britain and France concerning medium-range missiles have been formulated in isolated conditions. Now, in connection with the proposals for a radical reduction in nuclear forces that have been put forward by the Soviet Union, the situation has changed.

Comrade Gorbachev's visit to France has opened up fresh possibilities for the holding of further fruitful talks. It is generally acknowledged that the visit has promoted an improvement in the political climate between East and West. Our country has graphically shown to the whole world that it is ready to make its contribution to securing a peaceful, free and flourishing future for Europe and all other continents.

Broadcast to Britain

LD102157 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 10 Oct 85

[Nikolay Gorshkov commentary]

[Text] It is no secret that the arms race has been reved up not only by the United States. Suffice it to recall the British Trident program and the latest decisions of the Conservative cabinet on military policy. This shows that Britain too bears a share of the responsibility for ending the dangerous nuclear competition. After all, no Soviet-American agreement can slow down the British program for nuclear modernization. It is exactly the refusal of the Western allies to account for the British and French nuclear weapons in the overall balance of forces between East and West that created an insurmountable obstacle in the way of the previous set of Soviet-American talks in Geneva.

London was saying at the time that no one has a right to discuss its nuclear weapons behind its back. In spite of its own acknowledgement of close cooperation between the British and American nuclear potentials, the British has been closely guarding the so-called independent status of its nuclear forces. London was claiming also that the preservation of its nuclear potential plays an important part in world affairs. But obviously the most important and pressing world issue today is limiting and reducing nuclear weapons to bring the military balance to the lowest possible level. The Soviet proposal for direct talks gives Britain a very good opportunity to play a really important and independent part in world affairs.

Direct Anglo-Soviet talks would enable the two sides to establish a constructive dialogue, something that Whitehall and the prime minister have committed themselves to. For its part the Soviet Union has moved yet one step closer toward such a dialogue, having agreed to consider an agreement on medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe outside the immediate connection with the issue of space and strategic weapons. A positive response from the West, Britain in particular, to the package of Soviet peace initiatives would lead to a genuine turn for the better in the development of international relations in Europe.

The most dangerous aspect of the present stage of these relations is, in our view, the continued upgrading of nuclear weapons. One cannot but agree with Mr Healey that a ban on the modernization of nuclear weapons systems may be the top priority at the negotiations. At any rate, as Mikhail Gorbachev has pointed out, the Soviet Union can no longer turn a blind eye to the growing nuclear potential in Britain, the more so since the British potential will grow several times over once Trident missiles are installed in Royal Navy submarines and go fully operational. Here it seems Britain could realize its professed desire for a more active and independent role in world affairs by accepting the Soviet invitation to the talks. There are after all growing doubts in Britain about the costly and dangerous Trident project.

Judging by Michael Heseltine's statement at Blackpool yesterday, that desire remains a mere declaration. The Conservatives have shown no signs of wanting to abandon their dangerous military programs upon which their foreign policy relies. The indications are that they are about to miss another chance to show their independence and responsibility.

CSO: 5200/1071

JPRS-TAC-85-048
8 November 1985

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR: NEW FRENCH MISSILE HAS NEUTRON WARHEAD POTENTIAL

PM150748 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Oct 85 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent Yu. Kovalenko dispatch: "Ready for Production"]

[Text] Paris -- As of 1992, the new Hades missile that will enter service in the French Army may be equipped with a neutron nuclear charge.

This was first stated officially in an article prepared by Army headquarters which was published in the French Defense Ministry journal L'ARMEE D'AUJOURD'HUI. The most important feature of the Hades missile system, the article notes, is that it has the technical potential to utilize a neutron charge in the event of a decision being taken to inflict a massive strike.

According to LE MONDE, the Hades missile, which has a range of more than 350 km, will replace the existing Pluton missiles. Four artillery regiments will be equipped with the new missiles. The newspaper points out that the French president and the Defense Council have not yet taken the decision to embark on series production of a neutron bomb. Despite the Socailists' previous statement that they reject the production and deployment of neutron weapons, commentators are noting that a French neutron bomb is ready for production, which could be organized in the space of a few months.

CSO: 5200/1071

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR: OCTOBER COMMENTS ON DUTCH OPPOSITION TO DEPLOYMENT

Protests Intensify

LD090957 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0730 GMT 9 Oct 85

[International Affairs Journalist Eduard Kovalev Commentary]

[Text] As 1 November approaches, the date by which a final decision is to be made on whether U.S. cruise missiles will be deployed in the Netherlands, mass protest movements are being unleashed ever more widely in the country against the nuclear threat.

Dozens of Dutch people, peace supporters, and participants in the antimissile movement are intensifying their actions. Today the number of people taking part in mass peace actions is greater than expected. They are acting with much more confidence, foreign press correspondents report in their evaluation of the current scale of the antiwar movement in the Netherlands.

The reason for this confidence of success is the new Soviet position on the question of the deployment of medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe, which was announced in Paris during the visit there by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. The announcement by the Soviet leader of the reduction of the number of Soviet medium-range missiles on military duty [na boyevom dezhurstve] is the top news item in the Netherlands. The fact is that the Netherlands Government, giving way to pressure from the United States and NATO, has bound itself to embark next year on the deployment of U.S. cruise missiles, only in the case that the Soviet Union should have more than 378 SS-20 missiles at the end of October. Following the reduction of Soviet missiles announced by M.S. Gorbachev, this condition has in actual fact lost its force. The declaration by the Soviet leader has activated the opposition in the Netherlands parliament. The opponents of the deployment of U.S. cruise missiles are declaring with good reason that the Netherlands must not deploy U.S. first-strike missiles at a time when the Soviet Union is reducing its medium-range weapons.

Under these conditions, the Dutch peace supporters look to the future with great optimism. They point out that 2 million of the 8 million Dutch voters have already signed a petition demanding that the government refuse to deploy U.S. missiles on Netherlands territory. The collection of signatures will continue for 2 more weeks.

Those taking part in the antiwar movement in the Netherlands are mobilizing all their forces to achieve success. The Dutch members of parliament will be forced to take into account the scale of the antinuclear movement in the country.

NATO Worried

PM131810 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Oct 85 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Antonov "Letter From The Hague": "Halt the Missile Threat"]

[Excerpt] Will there be U.S. missiles on Dutch soil or not? This question is now at the center of all political and public life in the country. The major opposition parties -- the Labor Party, the Netherlands Communist Party, the Pacifist Socialist Party, and the Radical Political Party -- are urging the government to reject the missile deployment. They are supported by the Dutch Trade Union Federation, a number of women's, youth, and public organizations, many national parliamentary deputies, municipal leaders, clergymen, scientists, and cultural figures.

The country's leading antiwar forces, which have combined in a national coordinating committee called "No to Cruise Missiles," are currently conducting a nationwide referendum in the Netherlands on the question of attitudes to fulfilling the NATO decision. During the referendum each of the 5.5 million Dutch families will receive a postcard bearing the text of a protest against the missile deployment addressed to the country's parliament and government. All members of the families can sign it. These postcards will be presented to representatives of the government and parliament at the end of October, a few days before the government takes the final decision on the missiles. Two million Dutch people have already signed the appeal by the country's peace-loving public.

"Thanks to the referendum the missile question will be discussed by every Dutch family," (Sinni Strikverda), chairman of the "No to Cruise Missiles" campaign, says. The Amsterdam City Council has appealed to the Dutch capital's inhabitants to support the petition-signing campaign launched throughout the country. The authorities of a number of other cities and communities have declared support for this nationwide poll.

By tradition a Peace Week is held in the past week of September in the Netherlands. Mass demonstrations, torchlight processions, rallies, discussions, and meetings between antiwar movement activists and the rest of the Dutch population have been held in many cities and regions of the country. Pacifist sermons were delivered in local churches. The broad strata of the democratic public which took part in the Peace Week demanded the government's complete and final rejection of cruise missiles.

The mighty scale of the antimissile movement in the Netherlands is causing serious concern among the NATO militarists. Each day the country's government and parliament come under increasing pressure from across the ocean and from NATO headquarters, aimed at forcing them to accept nuclear weapons. THE WASHINGTON POST recently had to admit that this overt pressure has reached an "unprecedented scale" lately. NATO and U.S. envoys have become frequent visitors to the Netherlands. U.S. Vice President G. Bush, Lord Carrington, NATO secretary general, W. Rogers, NATO supreme allied commander Europe, and other missile enthusiasts in turn "express confidence" that the Netherlands Government will "do its duty toward its NATO allies."

Not a single meeting takes place at NATO headquarters in Brussels without those taking part urging the allies to show "Atlantic solidarity." At the same time this conditioning of the Netherlands is accompanied by malicious fabrications "about the buildup of the Soviet threat" and attempts to sow doubts about the sincerity of the peace-loving initiatives made by the Soviet Union. NATO's nuclear bosses have been doing their utmost to involve the Netherlands in a course of military preparations which is dangerous for the fate of peace.

Hundreds of people portraying victims of "nuclear death" lay on the ground in front of the entrance to the Woensdrecht Air Force Base. In that way the participants in one of the well-attended antimissile demonstrations expressed their protest against nuclear certain circles' intention to turn their country into the nuclear hostage of Washington and NATO. At a rally held afterwards speakers stressed that a Dutch rejection of the U.S. missiles would be a considerable contribution to improving the international atmosphere and would demonstrate the government's responsible approach to the problem of containing the arms race.

Christian Democrats Opposed

LD171953 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 17 Oct 85

[From "The World Today" program presented by Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] In the Netherlands, voices of protest against the siting [razmeshcheniye] of missiles are growing louder within the ruling coalition. Several hundred members of the Christian Democrat Appeal, which is included in the government, held a meeting in The Hague at which they demanded postponement of a decision on the missile issue. Their resolution stresses that the Netherlands Government should at least wait until after the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting has been held.

Beinema, a Christian Democrat member of parliament, stated that a number of new factors must be taken into consideration when deciding the question of the siting of the missiles. He pointed out that on one hand there are the new disarmament proposals put forward by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. On the other hand, there are the deceptive U.S. plans for "star wars." A report has appeared in Netherlands press to the effect that according to a poll, the results of which the leadership of the Christian Democrats would like to keep secret, more than one-third of the members of this party oppose the siting of U.S. missiles on Dutch territory.

Finally, a split has been revealed in the government itself. Dutch Minister of Defense Jacob de Ruiter, according to the U.S. magazine NEWSWEEK, has expressed the opinion that it is essential to seriously study the latest Soviet proposals, in particular Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement that the Soviet Union has kept only 243 SS-20 missiles on alert duty in the European part of the country, while all the other additionally deployed missiles of this type have been taken off alert duty and the stationary structures for their siting will be dismantled in the coming 2 months. Some observers consider that the movement against the U.S. nuclear threat has strengthened in the Netherlands to such a degree that the government will not be able even to make a decision on the missiles within the given deadline.

Are there to be U.S. missiles in the Netherlands or not? This will be the chief question at the parliamentary elections which are to be held in the country in May next year.

Against Netherlands Interests

PM231044 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Oct 85 First Edition p 3

[Lieutenant Colonel Yu. Borin "Notes Apropos": "Against Reason"]

[Text] The Soviet Union's bold steps, which consists in holding some of its SS-20 missiles from standby alert in a situation of the continuing buildup of U.S. missiles in Western Europe, has made a wide impact among public and political circles in many countries. Indeed, the USSR now has 243 SS-20 missiles in the USSR European zone. All the SS-5 missiles have been withdrawn from service and SS-4 missiles continue to be removed. Overall there are now considerably fewer Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe than 10-15 years ago.

In this connection the peoples of the European countries have the right to expect the United States to respond with a practical step -- to halt the further deployment of its medium-range missiles on the European Continent. But Washington and NATO are behaving otherwise. U.S. Vice President G. Bush, NATO Secretary General Lord Carrington, and other, lesser, officials have been stubbornly trying to extract assurances from Dutch official circles that there will be no deviation from the schedule established on the other side of the Atlantic for the siting of 48 U.S. long-range nuclear cruise missiles in the Netherlands.

Finding itself in a very awkward situation because of this pressure, the Netherlands Government was forced to "maneuver." On one hand, it wants to meet its obligations to its NATO allies and, on the other hand, it has to somehow justify to its own people its consent to the deployment of U.S. missiles in the Netherlands. Speaking in Tilburg, Prime Minister R. Lubbers declared that he does "not consider it sensible for the Netherlands" to be satisfied with the number of Soviet missiles remaining in the European zone as the basis for the adoption of a final decision on the siting of U.S. nuclear cruise missiles on the country's territory. Mr. Lubbers even expressed "some hope" that the USSR would go further in the dismantling of missiles throughout its territory. In other words, unless the Soviet Union decides on unilateral disarmament the Netherlands, according to the prime minister's statement, will simply be compelled to open its arms to 48 U.S. nuclear missiles.

Frankly, Lubbers' "arguments" do not stand up to criticism. As the Dutch media, including the ruling party's organs, note, the government's course of effectively capitulating to the NATO military suits Washington alone and in no way suits the Dutch people.

Nevertheless, in their public pronouncements representatives of government circles are overstepping all bounds. They are deliberately distorting reality and are keeping silent about the fact that NATO already has an advantage over the Warsaw Pact states both in terms of medium-range delivery vehicles (missiles and aircraft), and in terms of the number of nuclear charges delivered by these vehicles in one launch. The USSR has 850 vehicles and around 2,000 nuclear charges; NATO has 1,015 vehicles and more than 3,000 nuclear charges.

Their "arguments" that the Soviet SS-20 missiles are mobile and can therefore be transferred easily from Eastern areas of the USSR to its European area are absurd. If this can be done so easily, why, one wonders, is the U.S. so intent on dragging their mobile nuclear missiles into Western Europe, particularly into the Netherlands, instead of keeping them on the other side of the Atlantic, on their own territory? The Dutch press describes as "illogical," to put it mildly, all the Dutch politicians' various references to the Soviet SS-20 missiles in the Asian part of the USSR. After all, the 1979 NATO "two-track" decision does not envisage such "arithmetic" calculations and "Kamchatka has no bearing on the Eurostrategic balance."

But a Netherlands Government decision to deploy U.S. long-range nuclear cruise missiles in its territory, if it is taken on 1 November, certainly would have a direct bearing on the security of the Netherlands. In turning the country into Washington's nuclear hostage, Dutch ruling circles are clearly ignoring the Soviet Union's statement at the 1978 UN General Assembly first special session on disarmament that the USSR "will never use nuclear weapons against states which renounce production and acquisition of nuclear weapons and do not have nuclear weapons on their territory." The Dutch Government's actions are at odds with the Netherlands' security interests.

'Tension Rising'

LD221058 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0730 GMT 22 Oct 85

[Commentary by international affairs journalist Eduard Kovalev]

[Text] A new stage is beginning in the bitter political struggle in the Netherlands on the issue of the siting of new U.S. first strike weapons in the country. The anti-war and antimissile movement is increasing its activity, demanding that the government must refuse to agree to the siting of cruise missiles. International affairs journalist Eduard Kovalev comments:

Of the five NATO countries that have been earmarked for the siting of the new medium-range U.S. Missiles on their territory, the Netherlands is the only one which has not yet agreed to deployment. Tension is rising more strongly the closer it gets to 1 November, the date when a final decision must be taken on the question of whether or not 48 cruise missiles are to be sited in the Netherlands.

Those taking part in the antiwar movement in the Netherlands have conducted an active campaign against a disastrous decision of that kind. The signatures of nearly 2 million voters have already been collected on a petition to the government demanding that it reject the deployment of U.S. first-strike weapons in the Netherlands. Peace champions rightly point to the recent decision of the Soviet Union to reduce the number of its SS-20 missiles in Europe as sufficient grounds for the Netherlands to refuse to take part in the missile race imposed upon it by the United States and NATO

8 November 1985

As was stated by Den Uyl, leader of the opposition Labor Party, an extremely critical situation has arisen in the country in which the sensible decision to refuse the siting of U.S. cruise missiles in the Netherlands should be taken. Differences on this issue, which have exceptional importance for the country's future, have arisen within the ruling center-right coalition. While rightwingers are openly insistently demanding that the government make concessions to the U.S. diktat, some ministers who hold a dual position would like the final decision to be postponed. These circles have put forward, what at first sight appears to be a compromise idea that there should be agreement to the siting of cruise missiles, but that some types of U.S. nuclear weapons should simultaneously be withdrawn from the Netherlands -- obsolete nuclear bombs and surface-to-air missiles. This clearly farfetched concept is calculated to take the heat out of the antinuclear movement, to deceive the public, and to present the nuclear arms race as simply a question of modernization.

'Period of Hope, Alarm'

PM221402 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Oct 85 First Edition p 5

[V. Drobkov dispatch: "A Time of Hope and Alarm"]

[Text] The Hague, Brussels, Oct -- In the streets of the provincial city of Zaanstad the mayor is knocking on his neighbors' doors: "Have you remembered to sign the petition to the Parliament?"

A long table has been set up on the cobblestones in a courtyard of the parliament in The Hague, in the shadow of this grand building with the renowned Ridderzaal. On the table are antiwar movement brochures and leaflets. Two young men are explaining to passers-by what antimissile demonstrations are being organized and where.

Right on the border with Belgium near the Woensdrecht Military Base the police are brutally dispersing a peaceful demonstration. Dozens of people are arrested.

Scenes like these have now become an integral part of the Netherlands' present-day reality, the backdrop against which an unprecedented, truly nationwide struggle is developing in this country against the siting here of 48 new U.S. nuclear missiles. In one way or another, all sections of the population, all political parties, and all public movements of any significance are involved.

Allow me to recall that in June of last year the Dutch Government declared that it was postponing a final decision on whether new cruise missiles would or would not be sited in the Netherlands. On 1 November 1985 this respite runs out. The momentous decision will have to be taken as to whether the Netherlands should or should not be transformed into a launchpad for U.S. first strike nuclear weapons targeted on the Soviet Union.

Judging by the statements of Prime Minister R. Lubbers and Foreign Minister van den Broek, the government is likely to give way to pressure from Washington. It is no accident that U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz, closely followed by NATO Secretary General Lord Carrington, and other bellicose NATO figures have hastened to express the "hope" that this is what will happen.

Supporters of missile deployment in both NATO and The Hague are basing their stance on the deliberately false reasoning of NATO strategists who are trying to accuse the USSR of an "unprecedented buildup" in medium-range missiles, without being able to substantiate their claims.

However, these claims are at variance with facts which are perfectly well-known also among NATO staffs, namely that the number of Soviet SS-20 missiles on stand-by alert in the European zone is exactly the same as in June 1984.

It would seem that everything is quite clear. However, certain figures in NATO and, on NATO prompting, also in the Netherlands Government continue stubbornly to make claims about "the increase in the number of Soviet missiles." Reference is made to missiles sited in the Asian part of the USSR and there are attempts to get them taken into account because, allegedly, they could easily be moved to the borders of West Europe.

These claims do not stand up to criticism. After all, following this kind of logic would mean that all medium-range missiles currently in the possession of the United States, including sea- and air-launched cruise missiles, would have to be included in the overall balance. After all, it is even easier to move them to positions threatening the territory of the USSR.

The one-sided approach of the government to the missile question was sharply criticized in the Second Chamber of the Estates General. Deputies from the Labor Party, the Communist Party of the Netherlands, and a number of other opposition parties urged the authorities to carry out an in-depth analysis of the new Soviet proposals, it is expedient for the Netherlands to adopt any decision at the present time. Drawing attention to the upcoming Soviet-U.S. summit in Geneva and the new prospects which are opening up thanks to the constructive Soviet initiatives at the Geneva talks on space and nuclear arms, many local politicians are in favor of the Netherlands not accepting new U.S. missiles in a hurry because such a step would only complicate the situation in Europe and diminish the chances of curbing and reversing nuclear escalation. The prospect of the deployment in the Netherlands of foreign first strike nuclear weapons is evoking sharp protests from the country's population. Around 80,000 volunteers are currently taking part in a nationwide collection of signatures under a petition to the government and parliament demanding that they refrain from deploying the missiles.

The petition has already been signed by more than 2.5 million Dutch citizens! A public Tribunal for Peace which met recently in Rotterdam urged that if the government decides to conclude an agreement with the United States on siting the missiles, this agreement should only be regarded as approved if it is supported by a two-thirds majority in parliament. Many opposition parties favor this demand.

Under these circumstances the government is resorting to all kind of maneuvers to get a future agreement with the United States considered by the parliament not as a treaty of decisive significance for the country's national interests and therefore needing a two-thirds majority to be approved, but rather as an ordinary exchange of notes which could be passed by a simple majority.

Without waiting for the adoption of a final decision on the missiles, R. Lubbers' cabinet has already sent a letter to parliament summing up the terms for their deployment as agreed to with Washington. Hearings on this issue are to open on 22 October. The government is clearly in a hurry to prepare the ground for the acceptance of the missiles, despite the fact that even inside the cabinet there still are differences over the expediency of such a step.

The current situation in the Netherlands can justifiably be described as a period of hope and alarm. Alarm prevails at the efforts of quite specific forces to draw the Netherlands into the vicious circle of the nuclear arms race and to turn it into a hostage of the Transatlantic militarists. There is hope that reason will nonetheless prevail and that by refusing to accept the missiles the Netherlands will make a worthy contribution to the realization of the aspirations of its own population and all European peoples.

CSO: 5200/1071

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

SOVIET GEN LEBEDEV DISCUSSES SS-20'S IN DUTCH NEWSPAPER

WA250829 Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD in Dutch 18 Oct 85 pp 1, 5

[Article by correspondent Raymond van den Boogaard: "Moscow 'Shows' Removed SS-20's"]

[Text] Moscow, 18 Oct. -- The Soviet Union is decreasing the number of its SS-20's in the European USSR to 243 not by dismantling or destroying weapons, but by storing them at special sites which can be seen by U.S. satellites.

This was revealed by Soviet general Yuriy Lebedev this morning in Moscow during a conversation with NRC HANDELSBLAD. Dismantling or destruction, the following step depends on the course of negotiations with the United States, according to the general.

Lebedev, an official spokesman of the General Staff, further flatly denied that the SS-20's could simply be transferred from the Asia to the European part of the Soviet Union, as the United States says. Such a rebasing would require months and the activities related to this would be immediately observed by the U.S. satellites, according to the general.

He thereby confirmed the Soviet view that there is no need for the Netherlands to take into account in its calculations the missiles which are sited in the Asian part of the Soviet Union. Thus, Lebedev, also declined to give any further information about the number of SS-20's in the whole Soviet Union (which, as is known, is the criterion of the Netherlands 1 November decision).

The general gave a more detailed explanation of the term "withdraw from combat readiness" of the SS-20's, which was used earlier this month by Soviet party leader Mikhail Gorbachev, when he announced that the number of SS-20's in the European zone of the Soviet Union would be limited to the number in June of last year, namely 243. During recent weeks Western observers have racked their brains about the meaning of this term, because in previous arms negotiations between East and West there was always talk of "dismantling" or "destruction."

According to General Lebedev, the excess SS-20's in the Europe zone will be "taken from their launching installation and moved to special places so that they can be observed by the national means of verification."

"The stored missiles therefore are no longer aimed at a target, no longer have any mission to fulfill, and there is no longer any personnel present," according to the general. He said that further dismantling "depends on how we reach an agreement with the United States."

Stationary installations, storage places, and fuel tanks remain at the launching bases. "They will be torn down in the course of two months."

According to the general, "months and not just one month" are necessary for the rebasing of the SS-20 missiles from the Asian part of the USSR to the European zone. "They are not weapons which can be put on an auto, or which can move by themselves" he says. "Complex service installations are necessary, and nonmobile special constructions must be built for them. The rebasing of such a division also requires ground and technical activities which would be immediately observed by the national means of verification (the U.S. satellites -- editor). In addition, one rocket by itself cannot be rebased," according to General Lebedev. "The SS-20's can only be moved as a unit; that is done by train."

Speaking on SDI, the general said that diminishing the strategic arms arsenal would be impossible without a stop to the U.S. plan for a space shield, and that the Soviet Union has made this its standpoint.

He does make a clear distinction between fundamental and applied research on SDI.

"It would be unreasonable to demand that work in laboratories and behind the workbench should be stopped, because such things are not verifiable", said the general. "But whenever the matter is brought into the open and tests are made, then it is verifiable. And such work must be prevented, because it is a matter of direct steps on the way toward deployment."

Previously, during the negotiations in Geneva with the United States, the Soviet Union had also demanded the cessation of fundamental scientific research in laboratories.

The general did not go into questions on the future of the "tactical-operational complexes", the medium-range nuclear weapons deployed in the GDR and the CSSR, which, just as the "complementary" SS-20's, were an answer to the deployment of the cruise missiles and Pershing II's. Also, on 1 November, the unilateral Soviet moratorium on the deployment of weapons formally expires. "Let us wait to see what the summit meeting in Geneva brings," says Lebedev. "Let's hope that some progress will be made."

9274

CSO: 5200/1077

8 November 1985

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

BRIEFS

TASS REPORTS CHINESE LAUNCH--XINHUA has reported that a routine experimental launch of a carrier-missile has been carried out in China. [Text] [Moscow KRSNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Oct 85 Second Edition p 3]

CSO: 5200/1071

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

COMMENTS BY SOVIET ENVOY GRINEVSKIY AT CDE SESSION

Military Notification, NATO Maneuvers

PM140849 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Oct 85 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "At the Stockholm Conference"]

[Test] Stockholm, October 11 TASS -- The statement made by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to French parliamentarians on the Soviet Union's readiness to come to terms on exchanging yearly plans of military activities subject to notification is being extensively discussed at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe.

Speaking there today, leader of the Soviet delegation Oleg Grinevskiy said the scope of military exercises in Europe is among the more serious sources of distrust and suspicion.

As can be seen from the example of many NATO military maneuvers, the ground, air, and naval forces involved in them are not infrequently put on high combat alert and issued ammunition establishments, which makes it hard to distinguish these activities from the deployment of armed forces before a war.

In order to strengthen trust and make concealed preparations for war more difficult, Grinevskiy said, the Soviet Union suggests exchanging preliminary annual plans of the military activities subject to notification, which will include data about the major ground, air, and naval exercises in Europe and the adjacent sea (ocean) areas and the air space above them.

Sees Results as 'Positive'

LD181234 Moscow TASS in English 1132 GMT 18 Oct 85

[Text] Stockholm, October 18 TASS -- TASS correspondent Nikolay Vukolov reports:

A regular session of the Conference on Confidence and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe has closed in the Swedish capital today.

The results of the conference, Oleg Grinevskiy, the leader of the Soviet delegation, has stated, can be considered positive. The new peace initiatives put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, during his visit to France have had a positive effect on the proceedings of the Stockholm forum. Agreement has been reached at the conference on a transition to concrete talks on a range of questions, which could draw up outlines of a future accord.

Guidelines for the proceedings of the Stockholm conference have been defined by the joint initiatives of socialist countries. Their proposal on the conclusion of a treaty on the non-use of armed force has become part and parcel of the fabric of the talks. Discussion is proceeding energetically on measures proposed by them with regard to notification of major exercises of land, naval and air forces, troop movements, and also with regard to invitation of observers, which amount to safeguards against misinterpretation of actions taken by the other side.

The Soviet Union's readiness to reach agreement on mutual exchanges of annual plans for military activities that are subject to notification has opened fresh prospects for new confidence-building measures, called upon to surmount suspicions and to make it harder covertly to prepare for war. Lively debates continue on the proposals of socialist and non-aligned countries on the limitation of the scale of military exercises.

The topicality of these measures is obvious from the examples of NATO's latest exercises, which sometimes are so extensive that they can hardly be distinguished from force deployment for combat operations.

The decision that has been taken and the work that has been initiated on its basis, Grinevskiy said, show that the conference thus has possibilities for an activation of a search for mutually acceptable solutions. Progress, however, is being held back by the USA and some of its allies, which are trying to extend confidence-building measures only to the activities of the land forces, leaving aside the more dangerous services, the air force and the navy. In so doing, they are persistently pushing proposals aimed at disclosing the location and structure of the armed forces of European states and are seeking unilateral advantage.

CSO: 5200/1061

USSR: ARTICLE CRITICIZES WEST'S CDE PROPOSALS

AU171442 Moscow MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN in Russian No 10, Oct 85 (signed to press 18 Sep 85) pp 84-88

[Article by V. Shatrov: "The Stockholm Conference: It is Necessary to Move Forward"]

[Text] The Conference on Confidence-Building Measures, Security, and Disarmament in Europe, a regular session of which is now being held in Stockholm, has entered the second half of its journey toward the meeting of participant states of the all-European conference in Vienna which will be held in November 1986. As is known, this forum will also discuss the results of the work of the current stage of the Stockholm Conference.

In over 1 and 1/2 years, hundreds of plenary and working sessions have been conducted and numerous talks between the delegations and their individual members have been held at the conference in the capital of Sweden. The representatives of 33 European states and of the United States and Canada, and all participants in the conference have had equal opportunities to set forth their views on a wide range of questions connected with problems of reducing the danger of military confrontation in Europe, and to express their observations about and make proposals on ways of building confidence and strengthening security here.

The discussions which have been held have revealed the approaches of various states, uncovered the tactical line of their delegations, and (as many participants consider) shown up the contours of spheres of possible rapprochement of their positions. And if this has not yet taken on the form of the concrete accords which the peoples of Europe are waiting from the conference, then the fault here lies with the policy of those influential forces in the United States and NATO which, in their pursuit of the illusion of military superiority, are primarily concerned with not tying up their free hand to further build up weapons and develop their military preparations.

Unable to simply brush aside participation in the work of the Stockholm Conference, in the success of which the majority of European countries, including many of Washington's allies, are interested, the United States together with its closest NATO partners has adopted a course on maximum narrowing of its real effect and at the same time of using the conference to gain unilateral advantages to the detriment of the security interests of other states. Such an obstructionist line is tangibly braking the working of the conference.

This line is opposed by the firm resolution of the USSR and the other socialist states, which are persistently striving for constructive work, a practical rhythm, and the effectiveness of the Stockholm conference. Neutral and nonaligned countries and even some NATO states are coming out increasingly actively in favor of this, regarding the conference as an important component in the development of the all-European process, with which the hopes of the peoples on the continent for the strengthening of peace and cooperation in Europe are connected.

As the jubilee meeting of the foreign ministers of the 35 participant countries of the all-European conference in Helsinki, dedicated to the 10th anniversary of the Final Act, showed, the initiatives and consistent policy of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, which are aimed at reviving detente, ensuring the security of the European countries and peoples, building confidence, and developing cooperation between states in all spheres, is meeting with a favorable response from the majority of states. This is also reflected in the positions of the European countries at the Stockholm Conference, which the United States and their closest NATO allies cannot help taking into account in their tactics.

The USSR and the other socialist countries have been able to give positive impetus to the work of the conference with the help of their constructive steps and by supporting positive proposals by those participants in the conference who are interested in the success of this most important European forum. As a result of this, at the present time definite political, material, and organizational preconditions have formed for the achievement of a shift of the Stockholm Conference to practical negotiations with the aim of developing the first accords on confidence-building measures and security in Europe.

In the final analysis, what prevailed at the conference was a recognition of the need for mutual complementing of the political and military aspects of European security and for combination of steps of a political nature with confidence-building measures in the military sphere, for which the socialist countries have been persistently striving since the very beginning.

Even at the opening of the Stockholm conference the Soviet Union advanced a broad range of large-scale initiatives on measures to build confidence and strengthen security in both political and military spheres, measures which would be proportional in scale with the threat of nuclear war hanging over Europe and with the efforts required to eliminate this threat. The USSR made the question of mutual nonuse of military force and of maintaining relations of peace one of paramount importance. It was proposed that an obligation of this kind should be formulated as an agreement [dogovor] in order to give it the international-legal forces of law.

The Soviet proposal corresponded in full to the letter and spirit of the Helsinki Final Act and to the mandate of the Stockholm conference, where the need "to implement and express the obligation of states to restrain from use of force or the threat of force in their relations with one another" is clearly stated. Nevertheless this proposal was given a hostile reception by the United States and their closest NATO allies.

They also had a negative attitude toward other initiatives by the USSR on political aspects of the measures to build confidence and strengthen security in Europe, aspects aimed not only at reviving detente and opening the way toward disarmament, but also at laying the groundwork for firm foundations of peace and security on our continent.

These are the proposals that the nuclear states participating in the conference follow the Soviet Union's example and assume an obligation of non-first use of nuclear weapons and also for the liberation of Europe from chemical weapons, for the creation of nuclear-free zones in various regions of Europe, and for limitation and reduction of military expenditure.

All these proposals, together with those on the nonuse of force, are based on the agreed position of the Warsaw Pact countries, while at the same time taking into account the corresponding resolutions of the UN General Assembly and other international forums which have been adopted by an overwhelming majority of votes, as well as the initiatives of a number of European states on individual questions. The Soviet Union simultaneously declared its readiness to develop additional confidence-building measures in the military sphere which were of a more significant nature and a wider scope than those stipulated by the clauses in the Helsinki Final Act.

The United States and its closest NATO allies took up arms against the Soviet Union's wide-scale initiatives, for these contradicted their line of confining the tasks of the conference to discussions of secondary military-technical questions. The NATO countries submitted a "package" of their own proposals on precisely these questions to the conference, stubbornly clung to them, and for a long time did not even want to hear about the political aspects of measures to build confidence and strengthen security. However, thanks to the persistent efforts of the socialist countries, which expounded their initiatives in the political sphere both through bilateral channels and at the conference itself, to their firm rebuff to all attempts to distort the sense of these proposals, and also to the support given them by the broad European public and by many state and political figures, the socialist countries' proposals took their place at the negotiations table.

The delegations of the United States and their closest NATO allies had to change their tactics and maneuver. They began now admitting the possibility of confirming the principle of nonuse of force, now voicing hypocritical fears that "simple repetition" of this principle in Stockholm (which, by the way, none of the socialist countries even proposed), when it was already fixed in the UN Statute and the Final Act, would weaken its importance. It was also asserted that it was sufficient to express the given principle through concrete military measure such as those contained in the NATO "package".

The detailed document entitled "Basic Positions of the Treaty on Mutual Nonuse of Military Force and on Maintaining Relations of Peace" which the Soviet delegation submitted further developed the principle of nonuse of force, and moreover in those aspects which had not been concretized either in the UN Statute or in the Helsinki Final Act. In this connection, its correspondence to the tasks facing Europe in the sphere of building confidence and strengthening security was stressed, and attention was focussed on the most important point, which was the obligation not to be the first to use either nuclear or conventional weapons against each other, and consequently not to use the military force against each other at all.

The flexibility shown by the Soviet side -- the document was composed taking into account the wishes of a number of delegations, and in addition it defined only the basic positions of the treaty and left open the possibilities for anyone to introduce additions and more precise definitions to it -- undoubtedly contributed to this proposal becoming fixed at the center of the conference's attention.

The speech made by J. Goodby, the head of the American delegation, at the plenary session on 24 May this year essentially admitted that the line of the United States and NATO of not discussing the political aspects of building confidence and strengthening security in Europe, and primarily such a large-scale question as the nonuse of force, at the conference, had failed to all intents and purposes.

A number of Western countries, including NATO members, such as France, Italy, Spain, Greece, and others, are speaking in Stockholm in favor of making the principle of non-use of force take effect. Expressing the opinion of the majority of neutral and non-aligned states, the representative of Cyprus proposed that the conference adopt a solemn declaration of a politically binding nature banning the use of force in any manifestation.

There is no doubting the important role which increasing the significance and scale of the measures being discussed in the military sphere, which are conditioned by the socialist countries' initiatives, plays in the creation of the necessary conditions for the start of practical negotiations and the achievement of the first accords at the conference. This will make these measures capable of reducing the danger of military confrontation and of effectively contributing to building confidence and strengthening security in Europe.

At the same time the NATO countries' proposals basically deal only with the military-technical issues. (They are unacceptable in many cases simply because of their minor significance) not to mention the fact that they include many propositions that are aimed at legalizing espionage through the on-the-spot "inspection."

Many of these proposals merely create the appearance of some diverting attention from the main problems, they are essentially used to cover up NATO military preparations. Several of them directly contradict the mandate of the conference [on strengthening confidence and security in Europe] which envisages the equality of rights, balancing and mutuality, and equal consideration of the security interests of all participant states. They are clearly of a one-sided nature and they are not dictated by any concern for strengthening confidence and security in Europe but by the aspiration to establish control over the military activities of the Warsaw Pact countries and to uncover the structure and deployment of their armed forces.

Trying to revise the provisions of the Final Act, the authors of the NATO proposals raise to the level of primary importance notifications about the so-called "non-garrison activity," which means the movement of ground military units beyond garrison positions for purposes that threaten no one's security. The range and area of application of confidence-building measures are thereby narrowed down, the sea (ocean) areas and the airspace and adjacent to Europe are excluded from their scope, and such dangerous multi-purpose services of the armed forces as the air force and navy, as well as the U.S. double-base forces that are especially designed for transfer to Europe, are left out.

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries have counterposed to NATO's narrow military-technical proposals a broad package of extensive and diverse measures on strengthening confidence and security which are aimed at achieving military detente in Europe. These measures include in particular:

The limitation of the size of military exercises, taking into consideration the fact that the large exercises of forces, similar to those conducted by NATO countries in which a few hundreds of thousands of soldiers and many hundreds of aircraft and warships equipped with all types of modern weapons are often brought into operations, cannot be easily distinguished from the preparatory stages of deployment of armed forces before the start of military operations;

Advance notification about large exercises of the ground forces as well as the air force and naval forces carried out independently or jointly in Europe as well as in the adjacent sea (ocean) areas and airspace;

Advance notification about large movements and transfers of forces in Europe as well as in the adjacent sea (ocean) areas and airspace, something that is especially necessary in the light of the growing size and threatening nature of large transfers of forces, including primarily the transfers from the United States to Europe.

The proposals of the socialist countries take into account many considerations and observations of other delegations, including those of the group of neutral and non-aligned states. It is no accident that Sweden, Finland, Yugoslavia, Malta, Cyprus, and others have supported them especially in relation to the limitation of the size of military exercises and the extension of confidence-building measures to the activities of air and naval forces. Even NATO countries are clearly unable to dispute their significance. However, the United States stubbornly defends its position, especially in relation to the questions of activity of its naval forces, which has been observed on more than one occasion in various seas and oceans and which affects European security but which Washington strives to surround with a thick screen of secrecy.

The package of extensive measures of military nature submitted by the socialist countries and the consideration of these measures by the conference have clearly demonstrated the insolvency of the NATO "package" of proposals and the obvious unacceptability of many of its parts. Such terms, "fashionable" at the beginning, as "transparency" [foreign term used] (translucence) used in application to the military activities and structure of the armed forces of the Warsaw Pact countries have virtually disappeared from the conference's vocabulary under the force of soundly argued criticisms of a number of NATO's postulates by the socialist countries and, to a certain extent, also by the neutral and nonaligned countries.

Insisting on the unlimited expansion of information and control in relation to the activities of the ground forces, the NATO countries went back on their word when the discussion moved to the expansion of information and control in application to the air force and naval forces. They began to talk about the "unfeasibility" of inviting observers to the air force and naval exercises (although they saw no difficulty in this respect in relation to the exercises of ground forces). The attempts by delegates of NATO countries -- in contradiction of the Final Act -- to separate the exchange of information and verification from the substance of real confidence-building measures and to advance them as some kind of independent measures in their calculations to obtain one-sided advantages, have also turned out to have no chance.

In the face of the obvious inferiority of the NATO "package" of military-technical measures, general feelings have noticeably increased at the conference in favor of moving forward to businesslike and concrete negotiations on essentially important problems in the political and military spheres with the aim of achieving the first generally acceptable accords.

An organizational structure in the form of two equal working groups discussing both the political and military aspects of confidence - building and security strengthening measures was set up at the end of 1984 at the initiative of neutral and nonaligned countries. Advocating the beginning of practical negotiations "with pencils in hands," many delegations trace in their statements an approximate circle of issues and the outlines of the spheres in which viewpoints can be moved closer, and they list the "structural blocs" that are suitable for the formulation of concrete accords.

It goes without saying that the favorable prerequisites for the beginning of businesslike negotiations and achieving the first accords which have been created at the conference as a result of the energetic efforts of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, and as a result of the activities of a number of other states, do not yet signify an automatic guarantee of success in the work of the conference. The coordination of concrete confidence-building and security strengthening measures in Europe will require further efforts and time. The advocates of "antidetente" [antirazryadka] have by no means laid down their arms and they intend to continue to raise obstacles to and brake the work of the Stockholm conference and the development of the general European process as a whole. However the arrangement of forces and the general attitude of the broad sociopolitical circles of the conference's participant countries, including primarily the European countries, are not in their favor.

Europe has demonstrated more than once its aspiration toward detente and peaceful cooperation and toward protection of its own interests. The representative Stockholm forum, too, accords it the opportunity to weightily confirm this in such an area -- vitally important for countries and peoples -- as the area of strengthening confidence and security.

Copyright: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", "Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn", 1985.

CSO: 5200/1061

JPRS-TAC-85-048
8 November 1985

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS: GREECE INITIATES REMOVAL OF U.S. NUCLEAR STOCKPILES

LD2222215 Moscow TASS in English 1733 GMT 22 Oct 85

[Text] Athens, 22 Oct (TASS)--Answering questions of foreign journalists concerning nuclear weapons on Greece's territory, the government's spokesman Costas Laliotis said that withdrawal of nuclear stockpiles from the northern part of the country, which has already been started, is an initial step to ridding Greece of these weapons. The government's spokesman said that the recent speech in this connection by Prime Minister Andreas Papandreu, in which he said that modernisation or replacement of withdrawn weapons is out of the question, remains valid. This is the strategic line of the present government, which firmly declares for turning the Balkans into a nuclear-free zone, Costas Laliotis said.

CSO: 5200/1060

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

BRIEFS

DANISH CP URGES NORDIC NFZ--Copenhagen, 14 Oct (TASS)--A conference of the Danish Communist Party has ended in the Danish city of Odense. It adopted a special statement saying that the Soviet peace initiatives, among others, the USSR's proposal to cut by 50 percent the arsenals of Soviet and U.S. nuclear weapons reaching each other's territories and to conclude an agreement on non-militarization of outer space opened up possibilities for a fundamental change in the international situation. The delegates demanded that the Danish Government take effective measures to create a nuclear-weapon free zone in Nordic Europe, give up Denmark's participation in the [word indistinct] NATO maneuvers in the Baltic Sea involving U.S. combat ships which can be armed with nuclear weapons. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1136 GMT 14 Oct 85]

CSO: 5200/1060

GENERAL

JPRS-TAC-85-048
8 November 1985

TASS ON WEINBERGER 16 OCTOBER NEWS CONFERENCE: NEW ZEALAND, SDI

LD170804 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1430 GMT 16 Oct 85

[Text] Washington, 16 Oct (TASS) -- The United States intends to continue supplying wide-ranging military aid to such countries as Thailand and South Korea, Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger has stated in the course of a news conference which was relayed to the countries of Asia and the Pacific Ocean basin through the USIA "Worldnet" television system. The secretary did not conceal his annoyance at the New Zealand government's position, which bans ships carrying nuclear weapons on board from calling at the country's ports. Asserting that the presence of U.S. warships carrying nuclear weapons on board in the southern part of the Pacific Ocean "strengthens the security" of the region's countries, the chief of the U.S. military department let it be understood unambiguously that Washington intends to continue to pressure the New Zealand Government with the aim of forcing it to renounce its antinuclear policy. "If New Zealand believes that it can conduct such a policy, then the United States is also entitled to evaluate its requirements in the sphere of defense," C. Weinberger stated.

In the course of the news conference, the chief of the American military department unrestrainedly publicized the notorious American 'Strategic Defense Initiative,' attempting to present it as a type of "panacea" against the threat of nuclear war. Asserting that the program, which has been thought up in Washington, for the creation of a wide-ranging system of antimissile defense with space-based elements "threatens no one," the Pentagon chief stressed that the United States was "totally resolved to continue it research" on the "star wars" program which is aimed at creating offensive space armaments.

CSO: 5200/1063

GENERAL

PRAVDA URGES FAVORABLE U.S. RESPONSE TO SOVIET INITIATIVES

PM111155 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Oct 85 First Edition p 4

[Article by S. Menshikov: "The Chance Must Not Be Missed. The USSR's New Peace Initiatives: How People Greet Them in the West"]

[Text] The new Soviet peace initiatives announced by M. S. Gorbachev at the meeting with French parliamentarians have met with a very broad, approving response from the peace-loving public.

Antiwar organizations and groups of various political, ideological, and religious stands welcome the USSR's proposals, seeing them as a concrete and constructive program for resolving urgent questions of security and disarmament, and as a real opportunity to break the vicious circle of the arms race and prevent its spread into space.

Voices of approval are audible even from a number of NATO governments. This is understandable: It is hard to deny the attraction of the proposal for a complete ban on space strike weapons and for a 50 percent reduction in Soviet and U.S. nuclear arms which can reach each other's territory. It is impossible to deny the boldness and love of peace of a country which has unilaterally decided, without waiting for a halt to the deployment of U.S. missiles in West Europe, to reduce -- as a goodwill gesture and an expression of a sincere desire to achieve a positive result at the talks -- the number of its medium-range missiles in operational readiness.

Some official Washington spokesmen are now showing their "disappointment" with a sour expression. But, what is new about such a reaction? It was repeated earlier, when the Soviet Union proposed the limitation or reduction of arms. Previous Soviet initiatives were also greeted in the same way, including the moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles and the cessation of all nuclear explosions by the Soviet Union; both announced this year.

It must be said that today such a reaction is encountering increasing bewilderment and opposition in the world. Even certain very conservative U.S. figures, like Senator S. Nunn, publicly ask the question: Why does the administration stick so stubbornly to the "star wars" program? More and more people are asking: On what grounds are space weapons that are capable of hitting targets in space and on earth, called an "inoffensive" means which supposedly does not threaten the population?

People throughout the world are alarmed at the building of a qualitative arms race and the constant modernization of nuclear and other weapons. For it is a fact that at the same time as the Soviet Union was submitting the new proposals, the United States carried out its second -- since 6 August -- underground nuclear official spokesman said: This is how the Pentagon "planned" it. So, the only place in the "free enterprise" system where unconditional worship of the "plan" rules is the military-industrial complex. Whatever happens in the wide world, its representatives are firmly aware that the arms race schedule must not be violated.

It is not hard to imagine what the military-industrial complex would lose as a result of ending nuclear explosions. First, it would have to abandon the creation [sozdaniye] of new types of strategic and other nuclear missiles (for the creation [sozdaniye] of new warheads corresponding to the designs of new carriers is impossible without explosions). Second, it would have to consign to the archives the idea of creating [sozdaniye] nuclear-powered X-ray lasers under the "star wars" program. Third, it would have to abandon work on protecting present electronic and other military hardware from destruction in the event of the nuclear conflict which is being planned in the United States itself. To put it briefly: Military concerns would lose the multibillion-dollar orders and profits which are now guaranteed for years and decades ahead -- right through to the 21st century. The U.S. military would have to say goodbye to the idea of achieving military superiority and its aim of winning a nuclear war.

But how, supporters of continuing the arms race argue in Washington, is it possible to abandon the Midgetman and Trident II missiles and the Stealth bomber? For the corresponding appropriations have already been allocated to them and work is in full swing.

And suddenly, here are Soviet initiatives relating to a radical reduction in nuclear arsenals and a qualitative, not just a quantitative, halt to the arms race. The military-industrial complex is not agreeable to this.

It is characteristic that calls for an end to the buildup of nuclear arsenals in the United States itself are now emanating not only from mass organizations and progressive circles, but also prominent scientists, physicians, jurists, retired military men, and specialists in the foreign policy sphere. All are people who can in no way be suspected of disregarding U.S. security interests.

The idea of a moratorium on nuclear explosions enjoys broad support in the U.S. Congress. Last year, the Senate adopted a resolution demanding the resumption of talks with the Soviet Union on total end to nuclear weapons tests. This year, a similar resolution was approved by the House Foreign Affairs Committee. A draft "law on the simultaneous prohibition of nuclear tests" in the United States and the USSR is also being considered by the House of Representatives.

A characteristic episode: Two retired U.S. Navy admirals, Gene R. LaTocque and Eugene Carroll, addressed President Reagan, recommending the introduction of a bilateral Soviet-American moratorium on nuclear explosions. They received a reply from the Pentagon which not only tried to justify the continuation of tests, but also contained a shameless distortion of the position of the USSR and even of the United States itself. The admirals addressed the President again. Convincingly, in detail, and with facts at their fingertips, they refuted all the Pentagonites' arguments one after another.

Articles published in leading U.S. newspapers by R. McNamara, G. Smith, and other prominent politicians criticizing the "star wars" program and the joint statement by six former U.S. defense secretaries, who believe the time has come to heed the voice of reason, have had a great effect. Evidently, the idea of ending the nuclear arms race has many supporters in the United States, even in the ruling circles.

The history of the last decade shows the struggle for nuclear disarmament is bearing fruit.

Let us recall what a big role the extensive campaign mounted by the antiwar movement and peace-loving forces of the public, particularly scientists and doctors, played in the U.S. adoption of the 1963 treaty on halting tests in the three environments. Not only the technical possibility of monitoring the halt of explosions, but also the danger to people's health and the continuation of the human race as a result of the contamination of the environment with radioactive substances were proved by them and gradually came to be regarded as an irrefutable truth. The public's protests became so powerful and general they could not fail to exert an influence on U.S. ruling circles. Tests in the three environments were halted, despite the fierce opposition of the military-industrial complex.

But Washington thought up a compromise which satisfied the Pentagon and the military concerns: It was decided to continue nuclear tests and even make them more intensive underground, at a depth of several hundred meters. This was supposed to reassure an anxious public: Contamination of the environment has been stopped, they said. Even at that time, the Soviet Union favored a total ban on any nuclear explosions, but an all-embracing agreement failed to be reached because of U.S. opposition.

Since then 22 years have elapsed. The number of nuclear warheads in the world is increasing all the time. In the last 15 years alone this number has doubled, to reach 50,000 now. A qualitative improvement in nuclear missiles has also taken place, and one generation has succeeded another.

This modernization has been made possible by tests. If they had been halted completely back in 1963, there would now be no multiple re-entry vehicles, no MX's, no Pershings, and no long-range cruise missiles.

In the early seventies, the U.S. public played a considerable role in the conclusion of the Interim Agreement on Certain Measures With Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms and the ABM Treaty, and, in the late seventies, the SALT II Treaty. These agreements helped prevent the transfer of the arms race to space and in a certain measure, limited the number of nuclear weapons. But the qualitative nuclear arms race continued.

In our day, the senselessness and danger of further stockpiling nuclear arsenals is obvious. Even a small number of them is sufficient to destroy life on the planet. The continued growth of nuclear weapon stockpiles does not strengthen, but undermines the security of all countries without exception, including the United States. The world is on the threshold of a dangerous new phase: The further modernization of nuclear weapons and the spread of the arms race to space would result in a sharp destabilization of the international situation and an increase in the danger of nuclear catastrophe. The suicidal nature of a first nuclear strike and the impossibility of victory in a nuclear war have been basic facts of contemporary politics. The USSR, then the PRC rejected the first use of nuclear weapons and called on other nuclear powers to do likewise. But the high priests of militarism remain deaf to the demands of reason.

Today the security of any one state can only be guaranteed if the security of all states is guaranteed. This is what the new Soviet initiatives are aimed at.

Neither side can suffer and nobody's security will be harmed by the simultaneous balanced reduction of nuclear weapons and the simultaneous halting of nuclear explosions. The level of nuclear confrontation will decrease and world stability will increase. So what is preventing this?

It is being prevented by that very "militarization of political consciousness" of which M.S. Gorbachev spoke in his speech on French television. It is being prevented by the self-seeking interests of the military-industrial complex which manifest themselves in a militarized political consciousness.

It is they who are currently spreading the story in the United States that it is possible to avert nuclear catastrophe and achieve nuclear disarmament by creating high-technology "smart" types of weapons which would make nuclear war either impossible or "inoffensive." An example is the propaganda in favor of the "star wars" program. But these arguments conceal plans for a further intensification of the arms race and blind faith in the U.S. "technical genius" destined, they say, to restore military superiority to America.

It is clear to many, but by no means all, in the United States that this is an illusion. It will probably take another two or three rounds of the arms race to convince even the most diehard militarists of the unrealistic nature of attempts to upset strategic parity. But is not the cost of this "graphic proof" too high? For in that case, the mountain of nuclear weapons which would be literally raised into space would continue to grow and the danger of the outbreak of nuclear conflict would increase accordingly many times over. This is what alarms the peace-loving public most of all.

The statesmen of the nuclear powers bear a tremendous responsibility for the direction in which further development of the international situation will go, responsibility for the fate of peace and civilization.

The new Soviet initiatives and the whole program of Soviet proposals and measures aimed at curbing the arms race are imbued with a clear understanding of that responsibility. It is up to Washington. Will the sense of responsibility gain the upper hand there, will the demands of the peoples finally be heeded there?

The time to choose has arrived. The opportunity opened up by the Soviet initiatives must not be missed.

CSO: 5200/1063

GENERAL

MOSCOW TALK SHOW ON PROSPECTS FOR REAGAN-GORBACHEV MEETING

LD182254 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 18 Oct 85

["International Situation--Questions and Answers" program, presented by Sergey Pravdin, foreign political commentator of All-Union Radio, with "international affairs journalists" Yuriy Kornilov, TASS political observer; Rudolf Kolchanov; Anatoliy Naimushin, Sofia correspondent; Boris Andrianov, foreign political commentator of All-Union Radio; Nikolay Agayants; Pavel Kasparov, commentator; and Vladimir Fadayev, commentator]

[Excerpts] [Pravdin] The USSR's new peace initiatives and its consistent and principled foreign policy based on the Leninist idea of peaceful coexistence between two opposing systems are meeting with support and approval from the Soviet people and a broad strata of the international public. We are asked by war and labor veterans (Matvey Ivanovich Krasilnikov), from Moscow, (Pavel Mikhaylovich Gerasimov) from Tomsk, (Drapchyan) from Yerevan, and many others, to talk about the Soviet large-scale peace program. Its basic propositions were, as you know, set out once again in the report delivered by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev at the CPSU Central Committee plenum on what the USSR and the United States are taking with them to the Geneva summit.

Extensively discussing and commenting on the results of the CPSU Central Committee plenum and Comrade Gorbachev's report, eminent politicians, public figures and the press in various countries are now stressing that the USSR has once again forcibly confirmed the principled nature of its foreign policy course. This confirmation, as many observers note, has been made on the threshold of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting with which the peoples of the world link their hopes for an improvement in the political climate. What are our country's positions with regard to this meeting?

[Kornilov] In our contacts with other states, the USSR -- and Comrade Gorbachev's recent visit to France totally confirms this -- invariably gives priority to seeking ways to relax international tension and prevent the threat of war. The USSR would also like to build up normal and equitable relations with the United States. Confrontation between the USSR and the United States has never begun on our initiative. We also do not believe tension in Soviet-U.S. relations is to be explained by some sort of fated clash of interests. Therefore, we proceed from the point of view that both sides would have an interest in the success of the forthcoming meeting.

[Pravdin] And in the USSR's opinion, which problems should be the center of attention of the participants in the Soviet-U.S. summit dialogue?

[Kornilov] The most important problems of the present day -- on the solution of which depends the elimination of the threat of war, the rebirth of international trust, and the creation of the prerequisites for the solution of other urgent questions of interstate relations -- are the problems of preventing the arms race in space, ending the arms race on earth, the limitation and reduction of nuclear armaments, and the strengthening of strategic stability. It is precisely toward achieving these aims that the major constructive initiatives put forward by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev during his visit to France are directed.

[Pravdin] These initiatives aroused a very broad international response and even today they continue to be widely discussed throughout the world. How are they assessed in the West?

[Kornilov] The assessments are not all the same. They depend on the positions the various politicians and press organs express. But if, from the incoming stream of responses, one highlights the main thing, the basic element, then there is every reason to say that the USSR's peace onslaught is welcomed by all who cherish a peaceful sky over the planet. The sober-minded politicians and organs of the press unanimously stress that the Soviet proposals are creating a good and constructive basis for the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting.

This conclusion was also reached by the U.S. West European NATO allies who took part in an extraordinary NATO council session held at foreign minister level in Brussels a few days ago.

[Pravdin] And what is the U.S. position on the threshold of the Geneva summit meeting?

[Kornilov] To put it briefly, I would put it this way: If, when a few weeks remain before the meeting, one were to sum up the response that has been and is being made by Washington to the USSR's foreign policy initiatives, the picture would unfortunately by no means be what the Soviet and the international public would like to see. Yes, there has been some shift for the better: The Soviet proposals are no longer being cast back with a stereotyped exclamation of propaganda. Sober and realistic thoughts are maturing among the U.S. public, in political circles, and in Congress. But, one also sees other tendencies and other facts present at the same time, which cannot fail to cause concern and, what is more, alarm.

[Pravdin] What in your view is causing this concern?

[Kornilov] Well, let me recall just a few facts. In the period since 6 August -- when the USSR's decision unilaterally to halt all nuclear explosions came into force -- the United States has conducted three underground nuclear weapons tests, one after the other. It has conducted tests of the ASAT antisatellite system and of a military laser device -- acts which lead directly to the beginning of the deployment of space strike weapons and testify to the fact that the U.S. ruling circles are continuing to keep to a course of transforming space into an arena for militarist adventures.

[Pravdin] Who and what precise circles in the United States are not interested in progress at Geneva?

[Kornilov] The names and addresses of those who act as the generators of militarism and enemies of detente are no secret. It is not only right-wing conservative and reactionary circles in the Republican Party and not only the Pentagon, the headquarters of the war hawks. Behind the hawks who have built their nests on Washington's political Mount Olympus is America's big business and its core, the powerful military-industrial corporations. During 5 years of World War II, which took the lives of 50 million people, the U.S. armament magnates put more than \$120 billion of pure profit into their safes. And what is happening today when Pentagon orders are being carried out by 30,000 main contractors alone, and when Washington's program for militarizing space is being estimated to cost the fantastic amount of \$1 trillion? In 5 years the joint profits of the 10 leading U.S. companies producing arms have risen 2.5 times. The very powerful U.S. military-industrial complex is a most evil alliance of the bomb, the dollar, and the organs of power. These are the ones directly interested in world tension not being lowered; on the contrary, they want it increased and maintained at a level that would justify the development of ever more new weapons for mass destruction and the militarization of space.

However, and let us repeat this conclusion yet again, the situation in the world is now at a point where responsible decisions and responsible actions are required on the part of all states, above all those with significant international weight. It is more than evident that however diverse the political and social palette of the globe might be, all countries are faced today with the need to seek ways toward a world that would be characterized by trust, mutual understanding, and cooperation. A political dialogue is essential, a serious and constructive dialogue that is imbued with a sincere striving to uncover spheres of contact and a balance of interests and, extirpating the material roots of mutual suspicion and mistrust, to work together in eliminating the threat of nuclear self-immolation. The Soviet Union is ready for such a dialogue. It is up to the West.

CSO: 5200/1067

GENERAL

USSR'S ZAGLADIN INTERVIEWED IN AUSTRIAN NEWSPAPER

AU241415 Vienna VOLKSSTIMME in German 24 Oct 85 p 3

[Interview given by Vadim Zagladin, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee's International Department to VOLKSSTIMME in Vienna—date not given]

[Text] Question: There is a lot of talk in the West about a Soviet "offensive of charm"; what are the focal points of this offensive?

Answer: I do not believe there is any reason to speak of any "offensive of charm." It is not a question of charm; what is happening is the Soviet leadership is pursuing its peace-loving policy actively and resolutely.

We are not striving to defeat anyone, to win the upper hand over anyone. We are striving to make all countries and all peoples win. In what sense? In the sense that confrontation and the arms race are eliminated; the militarization of space is prevented; no offensive weapons are deployed there; chemical weapons are banned and destroyed; a reduction of conventional weapons -- beginning in Europe -- is initiated; and the world returns to the policy of detente and paves the way to deepening it and achieving a universal, mutually advantageous, peaceful cooperation.

Naturally, the social struggle in the world, the struggle between the systems will not end even under conditions of detente, of a consolidated peaceful existence. But this struggle should be waged in a peaceful form. In our era, a military conflict means mutual annihilation. The existing social systems must prove their advantages under peaceful conditions, in the course of their comprehensive competition.

Question: The latest Soviet disarmament proposals have touched off a strong international echo. Can you tell us something about the reactions of the NATO countries?

Answer: The reactions of these governments are not unequivocally clear. There are differences between the positions of individual governments and, what is more, there are differences in the positions of various groups or political movements within the individual governments.

Let us take as an example the U.S. Administration. After President Reagan was informed about the new Soviet proposals, he did not wipe them off the table, but showed a certain interest in them. At the same time, other representatives of the administration for all practical purposes rejected these proposals, such as Secretary of Defense Weinberger.

As far as the governments of the European NATO countries are concerned, they regard the Soviet ideas -- although they do not accept them as a whole -- as an important step

forward. The European states demand a mutual absolute compliance with the ABM Treaty and additional Soviet-U.S. treaties and agreements.

Question: Everyone is anxiously waiting for the Gorbachev-Reagan summit. With what expectations is the Soviet Union going to Geneva?

Answer: We know that the summit meeting is not going to be simple. Quite a few serious problems have accumulated, which primarily concern the halt of the arms race and nonmilitarization of space. Moreover, the period of confrontation has led to many different new phenomena which cannot be very easily overcome.

As M.S. Gorbachev stressed in Paris, in the Soviet Union it is believed that our era requires from a statesman a new approach, a new way of thinking. It is necessary to understand the complicated nature of the situation as well as the inadmissibility of resolving problems by force; one has to understand the need for a return to detente. One needs the political readiness to take steps in this direction.

We hope these circumstances are properly understood in Washington, too. On the whole one can say that, while not being optimists on one hand, we are not pessimists on the other, either. The Soviet Union is going to Geneva with a realistic attitude, with the wish and the readiness to achieve substantial progress.

Question: The Soviet side has stressed the importance of the neutral and nonaligned countries in the peace and disarmament process. Where does this importance lie?

Answer: The neutral and nonaligned countries, on the strength of their status, do not participate in existing military blocs, this alone gives them certain opportunities. The position of these countries -- at any rate the position of the nonaligned countries, which was defined during the last meeting of their foreign ministers in Luanda, and the position of the neutrals, such as Austria -- consists of their determination to put an end to the confrontation and to bring about a return to the road of stable, peaceful coexistence and mutually advantageous cooperation between states. They all believe it is necessary to halt the arms race, and they oppose the militarization of space.

Surely one can hardly assert that the positions of the Soviet Union, on the one hand, and those of the neutral and nonaligned countries on the other, are 100 percent identical. However, the most important thing is that the common striving for a radical turn in the present international situation is making itself clearly felt.

The neutral and nonaligned countries have repeatedly played a constructive role in the past regarding the development of the international situation. We need only recall, for example, the preparations for the Helsinki conference, the CSCE process itself, and the Madrid meeting. In Stockholm the neutral and nonaligned countries are now displaying certain initiatives of positive importance also.

I believe the role of the neutral and nonaligned states could be even more active. Just now we are experiencing a period where no reasonable, realistically thinking political functionary can afford to stand aside when the resolution of questions, on which the fate of mankind ultimately depends, ultimately is at stake.

9274

CSO: 5200/1077

GENERAL

USSR'S PONOMAREV ADDRESSES SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL ON ARMS RACE

PM181058 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Oct 85 First Edition p 4

[Own special correspondent and TASS report: "For Cooperation in the Struggle Against the Nuclear Threat"--uppercase passages published in boldface]

[Text] Vienna, 17 Oct -- The Socialist International conference on disarmament opened here yesterday in the Hofburg Palace. This is the second such forum; the first was held 7 years ago in Helsinki. The conference has gathered delegations from the social democratic and socialist parties of around 50 countries.

The leaders of many socialist and social democratic parties of Europe, North and Latin America, Asia, Africa, and Australia are taking part in the conference's work. A Soviet delegation headed by B.N. Ponomarev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; a CPC delegation; M. Komatin, general secretary of the disarmament conference in Geneva, representing the United Nations; representatives from the Nonaligned Movement; and deputies to the European parliament have been invited as guests and observers. Among the guests are representatives of movements struggling for freedom and independence -- the South-West African People's Organization (Namibia) and South African National Congress. An official U.S. Government delegation headed by K. Adelman, director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, was also invited.

The conference was opened by Austrian Federal Chancellor F. Sinowatz, chairman of the Socialist Party of Austria. A speech was delivered by W. Brandt. The opening report at the conference was presented by K. Sorsa, chairman of the Socialist International conference on disarmament which is being held here. A speech was delivered by Soviet delegation head B.N. Ponomarev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Despite differences in their approaches to a number of sociopolitical questions, he said, the positions of the CPSU and the Socialist International on the main problems of ending the arms race are either close or identical. Both communists and social democrats proceed from the understanding that the existing stocks of nuclear weapons are sufficient to destroy all life on earth many times over.

Meanwhile, the accumulation of mountains of weapons continues. A qualitatively new factor has appeared in the last year or two -- the plan to militarize space.

Mankind has now reached a line which, if crossed, might usher in events which would be uncontrollable and exclude the very possibility of reaching agreement on arms limitation and reduction. The unchecked arms race -- above all the nuclear arms race -- is already placing a heavy burden on the peoples in peacetime. There is a gigantic waste of material, human, and intellectual resources. In the capitalist countries, the arms race is leading to direct cuts in social spending and the growth of unemployment.

The leadership of our party and state proceeds on the belief that, in this new situation, the way of thinking and acting that has existed for centuries must be radically changed. The essence of the matter is that it is now naive to seek security by improving shield and sword. ~~In the nuclear missile and space age security cannot be assured by military means and military force.~~ Profound realism and political boldness are now needed -- boldness in taking steps capable of really getting things moving, putting a stop to the arms race, and starting the arms reduction process.

Its new initiatives, on which the attention of the entire world is now fixed, reflect the vigor and boldness characteristic of the Soviet leadership's entire style at the contemporary stage. They encapsulate the will of our party, state, and people to prevent a nuclear catastrophe.

The recent period, and particularly the months that have elapsed since the April (1985) Plenum of our party's Central Committee, has been marked by a number of fundamentally important steps by the Soviet Union in the arms reduction sphere, including a number of unilateral measures.

The entire world now knows how the U.S. Administration responded to all this. It responded to the ending of nuclear explosions with new nuclear explosions. It responded to the moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe with the expedited buildup of Pershing II and cruise missiles. And it responded to the proposal on a peaceful outer space with a test of the ASAT antisatellite system against a real target.

But this has not diminished the USSR's resolve to strive to curb the arms race. This is quite clearly established by the extensive program for improving the explosive international situation that was announced in Paris by M.S. Gorbachev.

The focus of the program put on the negotiating table at Geneva is the range of measures aimed at totally banning space strike arms for both sides and cutting very radically -- by 50 percent -- the nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territories.

The prevention of the militarization of space is a fundamental priority. If space strike weapons are created [sozdano], they may be used for surprise aggression in conjunction with existing nuclear weapons. Moreover, the appearance of space strike arms will inevitably entail an increase in the numbers and an improvement in the quality of nuclear weapons, including delivery means.

The Soviet Union has no program to create [sozdaniya] space strike weapons. But if the "star wars" program continues to be implemented, the Soviet Union will take measures -- albeit not necessarily analogous to the American ones -- to restore military-strategic equilibrium.

The other major proposal put forward by M.S. Gorbachev is aimed at facilitating agreement on a rapid reciprocal reduction of medium-range nuclear means in Europe.

It is of fundamental importance that the USSR considers it possible to reach a separate agreement on this question without linking it directly to the problem of space and strategic arms.

The Soviet Union has also expressed readiness to start an exchange of opinions on medium-range nuclear means with France and Britain.

The third exceptionally important step concerns medium-range missiles in Europe -- the region where the risk of a nuclear conflict is particularly great and particularly dangerous. The number of Soviet SS-20 missiles in the European zone now stands at 243, that is, it is back at the exact June 1984 level when U.S. actions prompted us to resort to countermeasures.

The immediate aim of the program for the improvement of the international situation is to reduce the terrible danger confronting the peoples. It does not encroach on anyone's security. Its implementation would mean the biggest step in modern history toward real disarmament, toward the physical elimination of a substantial part of today's most dangerous means of mass destruction.

This would be an abrupt turn for the better in the entire course of world events and would mark a significant advance toward a goal so dearly desired by all peoples -- the prohibition and TOTAL ELIMINATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS -- and would offer all people the optimistic prospect of life without fear in the future.

The Soviet peace plan for Europe, put forward by M.S. Gorbachev in his speech in France, has the same aim.

The question of what path Europe will take can and must be decided in Europe. Europeans are called upon to make their own substantial contribution to surmounting tension and preventing nuclear war. The Soviet Union is by no means planning to build a dam in the middle of the Atlantic Ocean which would isolate the United States from Western Europe.

Detente was born in Europe. But the principle of it is universal. The problems of peace are no less acute in Asia today. During their Moscow visit the representatives of the Socialist International's consultative council advocated setting up a "forum for talks on questions of Asian-Pacific security and disarmament." The Soviet proposals are in the same vein.

The Soviet Union's peace initiatives and proposals cover a wide range of disarmament problems on both a global and a regional scale. But in the West, especially on the other side of the Atlantic, they are still going on about the "Soviet military threat." They say this, but there are no grounds for what they say. Because our country, by dint of its social nature, has not threatened and is not threatening anyone -- either in the East or in the West. In the Soviet Union there are neither classes nor social strata for professional groups interested in war, aggression, or getting rich from the arms race. War propaganda is prohibited by the Soviet Constitution. Soviet people are unanimous about the arms race -- we do not need it.

The CPSU Central Committee October Plenum approved the draft new edition of our party's program and the draft basic guidelines for the country's economic and social development in the next 5-year plan and up to the year 2000. They state quite clearly and unequivocally our unshakable will for peace and our aspirations in the domestic policy sphere, which are exclusively peaceful and creative.

The Soviet Union's principle is peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems. And our country wants it to become an immutable law of international life. This also determines our attitude toward the United States, which the USSR has never intended to attack. No one has been able to produce evidence that the USSR is threatening the United States with military intervention and wants to conquer one or a dozen U.S. states. A threat cannot be posed by a state which is unilaterally taking such important steps and imposing such self-restrictions in the military sphere as we are taking and imposing.

The world public and people in all countries are looking forward to the Soviet-American summit with warranted excitement and hope. They have a right to think there will finally be a change for the better in the approach to the most pressing question of the present day -- whether or not there will be a nuclear war. The Soviet leadership is doing everything to ensure that that meeting leads to positive results both for Soviet-American relations and for the international situation as a whole.

But, unfortunately, it has to be said that some U.S. leaders are stricking to the old line. They keep saying that the "star wars" program will continue to be implemented. They are again talking about the Soviet proposals being one-sided in some way; they are looking for evidence of dirty tricks in our proposals. Some people are urging outright rejection of the proposals without even scrutinizing them properly.

Often they try to reinforce the false "Soviet threat" thesis with fantasies about the so-called "expansionism of the Soviets." But anyone who is even remotely acquainted with the Marxist-Leninist theory of the historical process ought to know that it eschews "export of revolution." This adventurist and futile concept was repeatedly denounced by both Marx and Lenin.

Throughout the postwar period contradictions in world politics have hinged chiefly on the clash between two trends, two approaches to the question of war and peace.

In the past 40 years the USSR has put forward proposals on the whole gamut of questions relating to ending the arms race. The range covers the nuclear sphere, including stopping nuclear tests; chemical weapons; conventional armaments; the strength of armed forces; and military expenditure. In limiting and reducing any type of weapon, the USSR will go as far as its partners are prepared to go. But, so far Washington and NATO have rejected or simply ignored the Soviet proposals. They have rejected or ignored them because they are banking on force, on attaining dominant positions in international relations, and on achieving nuclear superiority.

Behind all this we find, above all, the interests of those who are getting rich on the arms race. Lenin once said: "War a 'terrible' thing? Yes. But it is a terribly PROFITABLE thing" (complete Collected Works, Vol 26, p 377). Literally every day brings reports about big business' avid desire to get involved in the "star wars" program. The Pentagon has already signed contracts with 800 firms for the creation [sozdaniye] of space weapons.

The Soviet Union counters the sinister "star wars" program with the "star peace" concept. The proposal "On International Cooperation in the Peaceful Exploration of Space Under Conditions of its Nonmilitarization" was submitted to the United Nations by us. The peaceful exploration of space offers good prospects for mankind's economic and social progress. But, all this can become reality only on one imperative condition -- the militarization of space must be prevented.

The struggle between the two lines in the world arena continues. But we are confident the dangerous course of events can be overturned. There are extremely substantial grounds for our confidence.

The USSR has the ability to deal a crushing rebuff to all attempts to encroach on our security. The Soviet people have complete faith in their strength and in socialism's inexhaustible potential for responding to all challenges and overcoming all difficulties. But military confrontation is not our choice.

THE SOVIET UNION IS READY TO CONTRIBUTE ALL THE RESERVE OF MATERIAL POTENTIAL AND GOOD-WILL TO THE STRUGGLE TO PRESERVE PEACE. The other socialist community countries have the same stance. Many of the parties represented here have been able to see that for themselves. The PRC can play an important role in increasing the potential for peace.

Your conference is attended by representatives of the Nonaligned Movement. Its moral and political authority is on the side of peace. We rate highly the proposals put forward by the leaders of the six states from four continents in the well-known Delhi declaration.

This conference is also attended by an official representative of the United Nations, whose 40th anniversary is being widely marked in the world at present. We attach great significance to the comprehensive growth of the United Nations' authority and effectiveness as a unique and all-embracing organization designed to promote the preservation of peace.

The forces of antiwar opposition and of mankind's self-preservation are growing and expanding. Together they form a mighty potential for peace such as has never existed before.

The USSR is also counting on the common sense of statesmen invested with power in their respective countries. The tragic experience of wars in the century now drawing to a close has been a lesson both to ordinary people and to those who head states and parties.

The forces opposing the demons of war are truly incalculable. We are now witnessing a very important and highly promising process -- the most diverse circles are showing increasing readiness to support constructive new political approaches to resolving the disarmament problem.

The international workers movement established a tradition of mass struggle against wars and militarism long before its representatives gained access to the levers of foreign policy. "Socialists," V.I. Lenin wrote, "have always condemned wars among the peoples as barbaric and brutal." (Complete Collected Works, Vol 26, p 311). But, before 1914 and again during the thirties, the workers movement was unable to prevent the outbreak of war -- to a considerable extent because it was split and divided into warring camps. We must not and have no right to allow anything similar to happen today. History teaches that war must be combatted before it begins.

Joint efforts can achieve a fundamental turnaround in the international situation and the ending of the arms race. In documents and many speeches at this conference we have seen new opportunities for joint or parallel actions by social democratic and communist parties to which life itself and their position and world outlook dictate that they should carry out their prime duty -- to do the utmost to free mankind from the threat of nuclear annihilation.

That is why it is now very important:

-- to explain to the peoples the truth about the ominous danger, to prevent them becoming accustomed to the atmosphere of the arms race and to send the alarm, because time does not stand still;

-- to convince people that it is possible to end the arms race by means of serious, equitable talks, taking account of each country's legitimate security interests;

-- to promote mutual understanding and cooperation among all peace-loving forces irrespective of ideological differences and among all states large or small;

-- to move more resolutely from words to deeds; to work to turn the anxiety of hundreds of millions of people for the fate of peace into concrete, purposeful actions and various acts against the adventurist plans which lead to the unleashing of war.

The Socialist International and the parties belonging to it can do far more than hitherto to counter the fuelling of hatred and fear in international relations and to create the climate of trust which is so necessary for achieving positive results at talks among states. In this context, the CPSU confirms its readiness to develop constructive cooperation and dialogue with the Socialist International.

The speeches on foreign policy questions by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the bold Soviet initiatives have shown the world that the full force of reason, based on a thorough scientific knowledge of the international reality, high understanding of responsibility for the fate of mankind, and the steadfast will of our party and state leadership are directed toward resolving the great task of preventing nuclear war.

The world situation is such that no responsible politician or organization can allow themselves to remain aloof or confine themselves to general appeals.

The CPSU appeals to you -- social West and East -- let no opportunity for bringing all the factors of peace into play go unused.

Those present listened to B.N. Ponomarev's speech with great attention.

CSO: 5200/1063

GENERAL

TASS REPORTS UN SPEECHES ON ARMS ISSUES

LD221018 Moscow TASS in English 0810 GMT 22 Oct 85

[Text] New York, October 22 TASS -- By TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Chernyshev

Participants in the general debate at the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly stress the need for more vigorous efforts by all states in curbing the arms race and adopting radical measures in the field of disarmament.

Member of the Indian parliament G.G. Swell pointed to an extreme danger of "star wars" preparations and the mendacity of the assertions about the "defensive" character of the plans. He pointed out that the systems to be deployed in outer space can be used not for defensive purposes, but for hitting targets on earth and launching nuclear war.

Space should be free of weapons, its use should be subordinated only to peaceful aims in the interests of all of mankind, said Mohamed Shakir (Egypt).

He stressed that the final declaration of the Third Non-Proliferation Review Conference reaffirmed mankind's striving to strengthen the barriers in the way of the spread of nuclear weapons, to achieve general and complete disarmament and to cooperate in the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

The world community highly appreciates the package of Soviet initiatives the implementation of which would consolidate strategic stability, and mutual confidence. Edmonde Dever (Belgium) described their advancement as an event of great importance.

The Soviet Union responded with a concept of peace and cooperation in outer space to the "star wars" programme, said Deputy Foreign Minister of the German Democratic Republic Peter Florin. A U.S. positive response to the Soviet proposals, he stressed, would help curb the arms race and achieve disarmament.

Interrelationships between limiting the buildup and reducing armaments, on the one hand, and preventing their spread to other areas, on the other, become obvious as never before in the nuclear-space age, said the USSR representative Vladimir Petrovskiy. This is particularly apparent at present when the arms race threatens to spill over into outer space, to enter a qualitatively new stage. If the United

States carries out its plans to militarize outer space, this will reduce to nought both "vertical" and "horizontal" restrictions that have been put on the arms development through immense effort, he said. The ABM Treaty would become the first of the numerous victims of the weapons deployment in space. Every step towards developing "star wars" armaments contradicts the treaty's very essence, both its letter and spirit.

The package of major Soviet initiatives convincingly confirms the USSR readiness for implementing the objectives of the Geneva talks, coordinated between the USSR and the USA: Not only to stop the nuclear arms race, but also to reduce sharply their level and simultaneously prevent an arms race in outer space, the speaker stressed.

The USSR moratorium on any nuclear explosions lays groundwork for advancing towards the curtailment of nuclear armaments and creates favourable conditions for concluding an international comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty, said the Soviet representative. This measure would facilitate the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons, which the Soviet Union regards as a kind of "second front" in the struggle to eliminate the nuclear threat, curb the arms race and strengthen international security at regional and global levels.

The Soviet representative came out in favour of backing the establishment of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world, resolving the issue of the guarantees of the security of non-nuclear states, working out an international agreement on the non-proliferation of chemical weapons and the establishment of chemical weapon-free zones in Europe and other areas, developing a convention banning chemical weapons, and a broad range of measures limiting and reducing conventional armaments and armed forces. The Soviet Union appeals to all states to join in its efforts to open the kind of "second front" against the war menace, the Soviet representative stressed in conclusion.

CSO: 5200/1063

JPRS-TAC-85-048
8 November 1985

GENERAL

TASS: USSR UN DELEGATION SUGGESTS NON-USE OF FORCE DECLARATION

LD072305 Moscow TASS in English 2030 GMT 7 Oct 85

[Text] New York, October 7 (TASS)--The Soviet delegation to the 40th session of the UN General Assembly has reaffirmed its readiness to apply maximum effort for the earliest elaboration of a world treaty on non-use of force in international relations.

At a meeting of the Sixth Committee (Legal), the Soviet Union suggested starting work on a declaration on non-use of force in the nuclear space age.

Having adopted the declaration, the world community would impart an additional impetus to the early completion of work on the world treaty on non-use of force, said Soviet delegate Vladimir Petrovskiy.

This would serve the task of improving the world climate and advance the realization of mankind's dream of a world without weapons, he said.

CSO: 5200/1063

GENERAL

JPRS-TAC-85-048

8 November 1985

SOVIET JOURNAL ON ARMS ISSUES, EUROPEAN COOPERATION

AU211610 Moscow MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN in Russian No 10, Oct 85 (signed to press 18 Sep 85) pp 26-32

[Yu. Karelov: "USSR-Western Europe: Guidelines for Cooperation"--words between a single slantline published in italics, words between double slantlines published in wide spaced print]

[Text] From the first years of the existence of Soviet power, the European area was given a central place in our foreign policy. As far back as 1922, V.I. Lenin pointed out the necessity of composing a special program/for Europe/. (Footnote 1) (//V.I. Lunin//: Complete Collected Works, vol 44, pp 383-384) Since then, the USSR'S diplomatic actions in Europe have frequently become most important milestones in the information of the Soviet Union's foreign policy course. It stands to reason that this does not mean that insufficient attention is paid to other continents. This is an objective embodiment of the role which Europe has traditionally played for the USSR, the largest European state. As in our time, so too, judging by the calculations, for considerable time to come the Soviet Union's basic potential -- economic, industrial, and human -- will be situated in Europe, where over two thirds of its entire population live.

For this reason, it is natural that it is precisely with the countries of Europe that the USSR has a considerable proportion of its foreign economic relations. Hundreds and thousands of contacts are implemented in the cultural, scientific-technical, sporting, and humanitarian spheres and intensive contacts in many other spheres are carried on. Active mutual relations with the European countries have contributed to the practical formation of many of our principled foreign policy aims. It is sufficient to mention the Leninist principle of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. On precisely the firm foundations of this principle the rolling-back process from "cold war" to detente was initiated on the European continent in the seventies. Dentente gathered strength here and turned in a most important direction of international life until the course of confrontation with socialism conducted by the most reactionary forces of imperialism did serious damage to interstate relations, significantly worsening the international and European situation as a whole.

The resolute struggle of the Soviet Union and the fraternal socialist countries for an improvement in the political climate and for a return through international relations to the course of detente is also based on the premise that it is necessary to more actively involve the enormous political, economic, and also moral potential of Western Europe and the unique experience accumulated on the continent during the detente period in ensuring

a move away from tension and toward peaceful cooperation. Further consolidation of the community of socialist countries and of their unity and solidarity have been and continue to be a decisive factor in this connection. From this point of view, the extension of the Warsaw Pact's term of effect to the next 20 years was an event of paramount importance. Having placed their weight and authority on the scales of peace, the fraternal countries are full of resolution to defend the achievements of socialism and the violability of their borders against any threats and revanchist claims. They are doing everything necessary to maintain an approximate military-strategic parity in Europe between the countries of the Warsaw Pact and NATO, which is particularly important in light of the incessant deployment of American first-strike nuclear missiles in the immediate vicinity of their borders. The countries of socialism have more than once solemnly declared that they are not striving to achieve military superiority but will not permit the United States and NATO to acquire such superiority.

The states of Western Europe are living through a complex and contradictory period. To an increasing extent they are experiencing political, economic, and financial pressure by the United States, which is attempting to harness the West Europeans to its own policy and which acts at times from a position of totally unconcealed dominance.

There is a great "cultural expansion" from across the ocean, or rather a penetration of the American way of life with all its vices into Western Europe, which is threatening West European independence with irreparable losses. And after all, what is involved are countries with cultures thousands of years old.

It is impossible not to see, too, that Western Europe is now at the epicenter of the danger of war in the world; it is not for nothing that the European continent is increasingly often called the European theater of military operations in Western publications. There is no other place in the world where so many weapons, and the most refined and destructive ones at that, have been amassed in such a relatively small area. Two military-political groupings confront each other here. Never before has the destiny of Western Europe, including the answer to the fatal question -- to be or not to be, to survive or not to survive -- depended to such an extent on distant external forces.

At the same time, opposition to this is also growing in Western Europe, and attitudes are strengthening in favor of peace and against nuclear insanity, attitudes which bring hundreds of thousands of people into the streets. Many of them display examples of civic courage. An increasingly distinct understanding is being shown of the fact that the atmosphere of distrust and tension which has arisen in recent years is counter to the interests of Europeans in the West and East of the continent as well as to the interests of all other peoples. This circumstance cannot be discounted by West European governments. The situation which has been created in Europe is inevitably bringing them to an understanding of how vitally necessary a decrease in the danger of war, a reduction in the level of nuclear confrontation, and the curbing of the arms race all are.

There is simply no other way out. The Soviet initiatives are primarily calling not for an arms buildup but a halt in this dangerous and essentially senseless process. There cannot but be a response in Western Europe to the Soviet Union's readiness -- in conditions of the non-militarization of outer space -- to agree on deep mutual reductions of the strategic nuclear weapons of the USSR and the United States, and to its proposals to freeze, for the period of the Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva, everything that is under discussion: the creation [sozdaniye] of space-strike weapons by the USSR and the United States (let us recall that for 2 years now the Soviet Union has been maintaining a moratorium on putting antisatellite weapons into outer space), strategic offensive weapons, and medium-range missiles.

And the fact that the Soviet Union is ready for the "zero option" with respect to the medium-range missiles of the USSR and the Soviet Union in Europe, and is ready to leave only the same number of missiles -- calculated in warheads -- in Europe as France and Britain, the United States' allies in the North Atlantic bloc, possess, can hardly be unattractive for Western Europe. After all, should our proposals be accepted, the potential of both sides' medium-range missiles would be sharply reduced. In the interests of creating favorable conditions for the achievement of accords, the Soviet Union has for several months already been observing a unilateral moratorium on the deployment of medium-range nuclear weapons in the European part of the USSR and on the implementation of other countermeasures. Unfortunately, for no obvious reason no response to this display of goodwill has so far been in evidence. And while this is not unexpected "from the American corner", considering the confrontational course which the U.S. Administration has undertaken the passivity of Western Europe in the cardinal question of security is difficult to understand.

An enormous international response was produced by the Soviet Union's new important initiative, which was the decision to unilaterally introduce a moratorium on all nuclear explosions from 6 August, the day of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima. This decision was a logical continuation of the obligation of non-first use of nuclear weapons earlier adopted by our state. What is involved is a concrete, tangible measure which is expected to slow, and in the future to halt, the nuclear arms race. If all nuclear powers, and primarily the United States, followed the USSR'S initiative and abandoned nuclear tests, this would inevitably accelerate the "aging" process of accumulated weapons, and would create favorable conditions for the achievement of an agreement on a general and complete halt to nuclear tests and for progress toward the liquidation of nuclear weapons altogether. Having erected a barrier to the perfecting of nuclear weapons are having reduced the likelihood of their use, mankind would have made great strides toward a more secure peace, a peace free of nuclear weapons.

Having established a moratorium on its own nuclear explosions from 6 August, the Soviet Union offered the other side -- The United States -- a considerable length of time -- until 1 January 1986 -- within which to do this. Should the United States reciprocate, the USSR will firmly adhere to the moratorium after 1 January 1986, too.

The Soviet Union disregarded possible propaganda effects of these large-scale and courageous acts in undertaking them. The aim of the Soviet initiatives is to create real preconditions for the halting of the arms race and for a joint start to reducing them.

What about the threat of weapons breaking through into outer space, of which the Soviet Union is warning? The West European countries could probably act from clearer positions in this question, too. The plans of the United States undoubtedly worry them, and the American emissaries, of whom there are many in Western Europe, do not dispel these worries. Very serious questions arise.

What effect will an arms race in outer space have on Western Europe, if it becomes inevitable? How will the undermining of strategic stability which is connected with this be reflected in Western Europe? It is relevant to recall that all West European governments without exception have at some time spoken out in favor of preserving the key link in the present treaty and legal foundations of the process of limiting and reducing nuclear weapons, which is the 1972 Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems. They are also speaking out in favor of this now. This system would be overturned as a result of weapons penetrating outer space. A real anger would arise of an uncontrolled arms race in all areas with unforeseeable consequences, not least for the West Europeans.

The entire experience of European history, and of course not only European history, attests with full certainty to the fact that weapons do not ensure security on the continent. They lead merely to confrontations and new military threats. From here arises the urgency of cooperation between all European countries in the cause of eliminating such a danger and of strengthening stability through common efforts, in order that the security of each is the security of all. This is both the political task and the historical duty of all European states, whether great, medium-sized, or small. However, the greatest responsibility naturally rests with the major powers, such as France, Britain, Italy, and the FRG. By their actions or their restraint from dangerous acts they can make a weighty contribution to the relaxation of the military confrontation in Europe.

Many West European leaders voice an opinion to the effect that they are dissatisfied with the dangerous strategic situation in Europe. Well, they have an opportunity to play a role of their own in improving the situation by showing restraint, not encouraging actions which increase tension, and, finally, steering the American leadership toward more realistic appraisals and conclusions. It is no secret that Washington regards many phenomena differently from the European capitals. Perhaps because Europe better knows the cost of wars: Of the 65 million who died in the two world wars, 50 million were Europeans.

Now as never before it is important not to let slip a single chance to break the dangerous trends in the world and in Europe. Constructive approaches are needed with regard to unresolved problems, approaches which in practice, in a manner tangible to all, would make the situation different from what it is now -- full of feelings of mutual mistrust and anxious expectations of fresh danger of war.

It is far from chance that West Europeans, including political and state leaders, are more and more keenly listening to appeals by the Soviet Union to think over the present situation together and to jointly seek points of accord which would make it possible to restore an atmosphere of trust and mutual understanding in Europe. And primarily by taking steps which would have the aim of reducing the danger of war.

Europe was the first to turn away from "cold war" and confrontation and toward the formation of a new system of mutual relations between states on the basis of good neighborliness and lasting peace. The European states went further than others along the path of detente. This was helped to a considerable extent by the international legal consolidation of the territorial-political results of World War II on the European continent. The Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe drew up and adopted a code of principles of interstate relations which has since become an important guideline in European politics. The practice has become established of constant political dialogue, including at the highest level between the leaders of countries in Eastern and Western Europe. Multilateral and bilateral economic, trade, and scientific-technological cooperation has been successfully developed. Cooperation in the spheres of culture, science and education, information, contacts between people, and in humanitarian sphere has also gathered peace.

European reality itself has visibly confirmed that peaceful coexistence is the only possible basis for mutual relations between countries with different social systems. Without these positive changes in European life, which have become generally known as the all-European process, it would have been far more difficult for Europe to counterveil the restrictive consequences of those territorial claims which were finally settled with the signing of the Helsinki Final Act, just as it would be far more difficult for it to counterveil the new dangers caused by the military preparations of the United States and NATO.

From the vantage point of present-day experience, the political perspicacity of the USSR, other socialist countries, and also those West European states, primarily France, which stood at the source of the all-European process appears in a special light. The unique experience accumulated during the years of all-European cooperation serves as an example of how international relations can and must be built if one is really guided by the principles of equality and equal security, as well as existing realities, and if one does not seek any unilateral advantages and benefits but strives for mutually acceptable solutions and agreements. In this sense, Europe's example goes without doubt beyond the borders of the continent and acquires a world-wide, universal nature. As was noted in May 1985 at the talks between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and B. Craxi, chairman of the Council of Ministers of Italy, "Europe can and must play a vital and indispensable role in actively seeking ways leading to a return of international relations to the path of detente. In this respect the valuable experience of the seventies can be widely used." (Footnote 2) (PRAVDA, 30 May 1985)

The return to detente is, of course, progressing far from smoothly: the resistance of those forces which have bound themselves up with the policy of confrontation and which still cherish hopes of "rolling back communism" is too strong. Nevertheless, detente is forging a path for itself. Western Europe is becoming increasingly aware that detente is the only way to a peaceful future for the continent. After the waves of "antidetente" caused by the actions of imperialist forces, a certain nostalgia for detente can now be observed among the broad circles of West Europeans, and the word "detente" is returning to the vocabulary of West European political figures.

The Soviet Union is firmly in favor of reviving the process of detente. What is more, it believes that a revived detente must be of a nature which would fully correspond to the requirements of the contemporary stage of international development. In this sense it would not be a simple repetition of what was in the seventies. "Detente...", stressed M.S. Gorbachev, "is not the ultimate goal of policy. It is necessary, but merely transitional stage from a world crammed with weapons to a reliable and comprehensive system of international security." (Footnote 3) (PRAVDA, 9 May 1985)

Europe's potential for resolving this historic task is great. The European continent, being in many ways the political, economic, and cultural crossroads of the contemporary world, would only gain if detente and practical cooperation were to become the "natural and permanent condition of international life," (Footnote 4) (PRAVDA, 10 May 1985) as it is stated in the appeal by the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the USSR Council of Ministers "To the peoples, Parliaments, and Governments of all countries" on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the end of World War II. Of course, effort is needed for this -- intensive effort on all sides. Time however, is becoming short. Now is the time to fully utilize people's craving for detente to organize complementary efforts by states in the east and west of the European continent that are aimed at turning Europe into a continent of peace and cooperation. To fulfill this noble task, the Soviet Union would like to be able to regard the West Europeans as like minded people and as its natural allies.

In this respect, the Soviet Union is naturally far from the idea of setting Western Europe in opposition to any of its partners. It also does not view the West Europeans through the prism of its relations with the United States. Whatever solutions may be found to the global problems of war and peace depend on the actions and responsibility of all countries without exception, regardless on the continent on which they lie. There is also no question of the fact that a great deal in the world is connected with how Soviet-American relations develop further. Of course, if realism predominated in Washington's foreign policy course and if the American leadership not in words, but in deeds showed willingness for joint solutions to urgent international problems, this

would have a positive effect on the state of world, and European affairs. Positive results at the Stockholm Conference should serve as a concrete manifestation of the political will of the whole of Europe for establishing an atmosphere of stable peace and trust on the continent. Reaching a mutually acceptable agreement at this conference, which would combine measures of political significance and measures of a military-technical nature, acquires decisive significance. An agreement [Dogovorenost] on the nonuse of force in international relations must be stronger and more binding than stipulated in the UN Charter and the Final Act of the all-European conference. In any case, such an agreement must be serious and must place obligations on every signatory state which would be strictly fulfilled.

The principles course of the Soviet Union, which is aimed at lowering the level of military confrontation in Europe, particularly in the nuclear sphere, is embodied in a complex of recent Soviet initiatives which have fully retained their topicality. We propose that all nuclear power follow the example of the Soviet Union and assume the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons; to freeze the nuclear arsenals of all nuclear powers -- and those of the USSR and the United States first of all -- in both quantitative and qualitative respects, in order to proceed without delay to reducing these weapons until they are totally liquidated; to conclude a treaty [Dogovor] on the mutual nonuse of military force and the maintenance of peaceful relations between Warsaw Pact member-states and NATO member-countries, and between all participants in the all-European conference; to reach agreement on a complete and general ban on nuclear weapons tests; and to conclude an international convention on banning and liquidating such a barbaric means of mass destruction as chemical weapons.

In the interests of ensuring military detente in Europe, the USSR actively supports the idea of forming nuclear free zones in various regions of the continent, including northern Europe and the Balkans. The search for new forms of mutually advantageous cooperation with West European countries also merits attention. In this respect the establishment of official contacts between such major economic groups on the European continent as the EEC and CEMA could be of mutual benefit. Even now it would

Even now it would be possible, for example, to enter into mutually advantageous cooperation in a number of areas, including trade, the supply of energy and raw materials, the sphere of scientific-technological progress, the development of international transport, and environmental protection. Considering the fact that in some cases the EEC acts as a separate "political unit," in this respect one could seek points of contact both within the framework of general European interests and on concrete international problems. The West Europeans could make an important and positive contribution to resolving such a major long-term problem as that of organizing extensive, mutually advantageous scientific-technological cooperation in conquering outer space. Prospects for such extensive cooperation, which would hardly be within the capabilities of any state taken individually, were opened up by the recent Soviet proposal of international cooperation in the peaceful development of outer space, which was submitted for inclusion in the agenda of the 40th session of the UN General Assembly. It seems that the idea, inherent in the Soviet proposal, of joint efforts by states aimed at preventing an arms race in outer space, followed by a move toward extensive international cooperation envisaging access for all states, without discrimination, to the results of scientific and technological achievements, could prove to be close the hearts of many West European countries.

The range of possibilities for establishing multilateral mutually advantageous links between the countries of Europe in various spheres is broad, as was confirmed at the jubilee session in Helsinki of ministers of foreign affairs from countries participant in the all-European conference.

It could be a question of major all-European initiatives for the development of trade and economic cooperation on the basis of contemporary technology, of wider contacts in a whole number of areas, such as culture, education, medicine, meetings between the public and individual citizens, and so forth. However, the main role in the general activation of cooperation in Europe belongs, without doubt, to political contacts.

It is precisely within this context that news of M.S. Gorbachev's visit to France on the 2-5 October of this year was received in Europe -- and not only in Europe. Not without foundation, international response stressed that it was a question of an exceptionally important action by Soviet foreign policy with regard to both Soviet-French relations and the effect on the state of affairs in the world and in Europe as a whole. Experience has proved that contacts at a high level and at top level are a very effective means of achieving mutual understanding and working out concrete, effective agreement. Those meetings and talks which have taken place in recent months between Soviet leaders and state and political figures from France, Italy, Britain, the FRG, Spain, and also the United States and other countries that are participants in the all-European conference, attest to the fact that Western Europe is showing a desire to take some steps to improve the situation. Naturally there are still differences in appraisals, of, and approaches to a number of fundamental aspects of the world situation. However, there is always room for reasonable compromises in politics and diplomacy.

If precisely such an approach prevails and if dialogue and negotiations are accompanied by concrete actions, then, without any doubt, it would be possible to count on reaching those mutually acceptable agreements which the European continent so needs. Of course, this is not the task of a day, but its fulfillment is brought nearer by constant, patient work and by manifestation of a sense of restraint and responsibility. The Soviet Union proceeds from the fact that there is a possibility of strengthening stability and security on the European continent, radically lowering the level of military confrontation, and turning European line toward constructive, mutually advantageous cooperation between states with different social systems.

Copyright: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", "Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn", 1985.

CSO: 5200/1063

8 November 1985

GENERAL

CHINA DAILY COMMENTATOR ON PEACE, DISARMAMENT

HK180333 Beijing CHINA DAILY in English 18 Oct 85 p.4

[Commentator's article: "Peace and Disarmament"]

[Excerpt] Like other developing countries in the Third World, China is deeply concerned over world peace. It has worked consistently to relax world tension and for just and fair solutions to regional issues that threaten world peace. China's stand on the important question of disarmament has been positive, practical and reasonable.

China holds that the two nuclear powers, which possess 95 percent of the world's nuclear weapons, should take the lead in sharply reducing their nuclear arsenals. China has further presented a four-point proposal to pave the way towards final, total disarmament. They are:

--Pending the conclusion of an international convention to ban nuclear weapons by all nuclear states, the United States and the Soviet Union should undertake not to be the first to use nuclear weapons under any circumstances, nor threaten any non-nuclear states with such weapons.

--The two superpowers must immediately halt the arms race in any form in outer space, and reach an international agreement to ban and destroy all outer space weaponry.

--The North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Warsaw Pact Organization should both cut their conventional arsenals.

--And chemical weapons should be completely prohibited.

China keeps a limited number of nuclear weapons for the sole purpose of self-defence and to counter nuclear blackmail. From the day it began to acquire a nuclear force, China has declared time and again that it would never be the first to use nuclear weapons. China is now in the process of reducing its armed forces by 1 million, a not insignificant figure. It has thus demonstrated a sincere desire to work for peace and disarmament through deeds rather than rhetoric.

The two superpowers have been conducting arms control talks in Geneva on and off for quite some time. But so far not much of substance has come from these talks. On the contrary, their nuclear arsenals keep growing.

GENERAL

BRIEFS

TASS ON UN RADIATION REPORT--New York, October 4, (TASS)--The draft resolution proposing approval of the important work of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the effects of atomic radiation was submitted today by a group of countries, including the Soviet Union, for consideration of the UN General Assembly's special political committee which started the discussion of effects of atomic radiation. The discussion of the document testifies to the interest of the international community in the early and complete prohibition of tests of nuclear weapons, establishment of nuclear-free zones in different regions, peoples' support for the USSR's important initiative--the unilateral moratorium on any nuclear explosions. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 2129 GMT 4 Oct 85]

CSO: 5200/1063

END